

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 15 1953

CONTENTS

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

CAMERON, J. W.—The Manuscript Version of Apollinaire's "Sanglots,"	367
REES, G. O.—Types of Recurring Similes in Malraux's Novels, -	373
LANCASTER, H. C.—Letters of Lafon to Napoleon, Talma, and Others, -	377
BORGERHOFF, E. B. O.—The Anagram in 'Le Rouge et le noir,' -	383
WOODFORD, ARCHER.—More about Identity of Miçer Francisco Imperial,	386
SCHNEIDER, HEINRICH.—Zu Lessings Faust, -	389
BENTLEY, C. A.—Rilke's 'Sonette an Orpheus' and Max Dauthendey, -	393
FISHER, C. B.—Several Allusions in Brant's 'Narrenschiff,' -	395
METZDORF, R. F.—Samuel Johnson in Brunswick, -	397
WILLIAMS, PHILIP.—The Rosemary Theme in 'Romeo and Juliet,' -	400
SERONSY, C. C.—Wordsworth's Annotations in Daniel's 'Poetical Works,' -	403
PECK, L. F.—'The Monk' and 'Le Diable amoureux,' -	406
ALMIRALL, C. L.—Smollett's "Gothic": an Illustration, -	408
FRANÇON, MARCEL.—The 'Roman de la Rose' and Vauquelin de la Fresnaie, -	410
CROWLEY, F. J.—Additions to Bengesco's 'Bibliographie,' -	411

REVIEWS:—

ERNST BEUTLER (ed.), Goethe—Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche. [Ernst Feise.] -	412
E. H. ZEYDEL and B. Q. MORGAN (trs.), Wolfram's Parzival. [F. H. Ellis.]	415
HUGO KUHN, Minnesangs Wende. [T. P. Thornton.]	416
W. T. PATTISON (ed.), The Life and Works of the Troubadour Raimbaut d'Orange. [A. H. Schutz.] -	418
E. M. W. TILLYARD, The English Renaissance: Fact or Fiction? [Rose- mond Tuve.] -	421
E. A. STRATHMANN, Sir Walter Raleigh. A Study in Elizabethan Skepti- cism. [M. Y. Hughes.] -	423
HALLETT SMITH, Elizabethan Poetry. [Leicester Bradner.] -	425
L. E. DADNEY, French Dramatic Literature in the Reign of Henri IV. [H. C. Lancaster.] -	427
W. B. GARDNER (ed.), The Prologues and Epilogues of John Dryden. [Hoyt Trowbridge.] -	428
LOUIS HERLAND, Horace ou Naissance de l'homme. [H. C. Lancaster.]	430
WAYNE SHUMAKER, Elements of Critical Theory. [George Boas.] -	431
DOUGLAS KNIGHT, Pope and the Heroic Tradition: A Critical Study of His Iliad. [H. T. Swedenberg, Jr.] -	432
W. L. McDONALD, Pope and His Critics. [J. R. Moore.] -	434
THEODORE BESTERMAN (ed.), Voltaire's Notebooks. [H. C. Lancaster.]	435

BRIEF MENTION: E. L. STEEVES (ed.), The Art of Sinking in Poetry: Martinus Scriblerus' "HEPI BAOTTE"; HELEN GARDNER (ed.), The Divine Poems. By John Donne; MORRIS BISHOP, The Life and Adventures of La Rochefoucauld: J. F. MARSHALL (ed.), Stendhal, Henri III, Un Acte inédit, -	436
--	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

DON CAMERON ALLEN

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

EARL R. WASSERMAN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis,
L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the Current annual volume is \$6.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$6.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price one dollar.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

AGRIPPA D'AUBIGNÉ'S LES TRAGIQUES

A Study in Structure and Poetic Method

By HENRY A. SAUERWEIN, JR.

Based upon a close analysis of the text itself, this critical study shows d'Aubigné's epic poem, *Les Tragiques*, as neither obscure or confused — as critical tradition has seen it — but rather the result wholly of conscious artistry and structurally a clear and well-organized entity. For the first time the author, d'Aubigné, has been treated not as a Protestant, or a historian, but as an artist, and his great poem not so much as religious polemic as a work of art in its own right, worthy of a place in the French literary tradition.

1953

256 pages

\$3.50



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Editors
g on the
uscript
articles
to the
titles of
. Quo-
3, not
", MP.",
editors
business

litors
on the
script
ticles
o the
es of
Quo-
not
MP.,
litors
iness

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVIII

JUNE, 1953

Number 6

THE MANUSCRIPT VERSION OF APOLLINAIRE'S "SANGLOTS"

The manuscript of the poem "Sanglots" by Guillaume Apollinaire, the facsimile of which is presented herewith, may be found in the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, in the Bibliothèque Littéraire Jacques Doucet, Paris.

After its first appearance in print in the *Nord-Sud* of June-July, 1917, the poem was reprinted at least four other times, in *Images de Paris*, January-February, 1924, in the posthumous collection *Il y a* (Messein, 1925) and its later reprints, in Moulin, *Manuel poétique d'Apollinaire* (Brussels: Cabinet des Poètes, 1939), and finally in the limited edition of *Il y a* (Grégoire, 1947). With the exception of minor variants, such as failure to indent, forgetting to delete certain punctuation marks, or neglecting to capitalize one word, these versions of the poem diverge in no way from the first, that of *Nord-Sud*:

Notre amour est réglé par les calmes étoiles
Or nous savons qu'en nous beaucoup d'hommes respirent
Qui vinrent de très loin et sont un sous nos fronts
C'est la chanson des rêveurs
Qui s'étaient arraché le cœur
Et le portaient dans la main droite
Souviens-t'en cher orgueil de tous ces souvenirs

Des marins qui chantaient comme des conquérants
Des gouffres de Thulé des tendres cieux d'Ophir
Des malades maudits de ceux qui fuient leur ombre
Et du retour joyeux des heureux émigrants
De ce cœur il coulait du sang
Et le rêveur allait pensant
A sa blessure délicate

Tu ne briseras pas la chaîne de ces causes
 Et douloureuse et nous disait
 Qui sont les effets d'autres causes
 Mon pauvre cœur mon cœur brisé
 Pareil au cœur de tous les hommes
 Voici voici nos mains que la vie fit esclaves
 Est mort d'amour ou c'est tout comme
 Est mort d'amour et le voici Ainsi vont toutes choses
 Arrachez donc le vôtre aussi
 Et rien ne sera libre jusqu'à la fin des temps
 Laissons tout aux morts
 Et cachons nos sanglots¹

If the above traditional reading fails to raise several questions in the reader's mind, careful examination of the manuscript facsimile will cause serious doubt as to whether the poet's wishes have been fulfilled by any of the printed versions.

"Sanglots" is written on the back of a meteorological bulletin from the agency "Radio." The paper, measuring 30.8 by 21 centimeters, originally bore the report of weather conditions for "lundi 9 avril 1917," its primary use thus enabling us to fix the approximate date of composition as between April 9 and June, 1917. Apollinaire, who often recorded his poems on such material,² penned this one in violet ink, not dissimilar to the hectograph variety. But by far the most striking, and for our purposes significant feature of the manuscript is the general appearance of the page.

It is immediately apparent that the poet first wrote a section of predominantly twelve syllable lines, comfortably distributed in a manner which fills the page. Subsequently, apparently as an afterthought, he must have decided to insert a series of octosyllabic verses, presumably beginning the insertion after the third line of the first section, which we shall call for convenience section A. Section B, the octosyllabic lines, refused to fit easily in the margin, however, and their author, realizing that the position of line four of section A would not permit further invocation of the wounded heart, sought other places to continue the song. Finding little room elsewhere, he merely warped the lines adroitly when there

¹ This version is copied from *Il y a* (Messein, 1949, pp. 87-88).

² "Bleuet," *ibid.*, p. 89, is written on the verso of a dispatch from New York; earlier, "La Porte," *Alcools* (Gallimard, 1920, p. 73), was scrawled on the back of a handbill for the review *Vers et prose*.

was danger of superscription, and finished the remaining development.

In so doing, however, he contributed to a dubious interpretation of the poem which has prevailed to this day; for the editors, if indeed they have considered the manuscript at all, and have not merely followed previously printed versions, have been unanimous in believing that the lines are in reality to be shuffled as the manuscript would seem to indicate.

It must be admitted, nevertheless, that their fidelity to this aspect of the manuscript and to tradition has created numerous problems of a poetic and grammatical nature:

From the general point of view, the poem as now printed is a confused mixture of the metaphysical and the lyrical. Not that the device of mingling the cosmic and intensely personal is foreign to Apollinaire's technique; in "Zone" and in "Vendémiaire," for example, to mention only two instances, such treatment is extremely forceful. In the case of "Sanglots," however, with its lines shuffled, the "device" not only lacks force, it creates dubious syntax. Consider the eleven lines following "De ce cœur il coulait du sang," a passage in which the adjective "douloureuse" has strayed a great distance from the "blessure," and in which "disait" must search for its subject behind the intervening "chaîne de ces causes." But the most extreme result of the editorial interpretation is the connection of "Est mort d'amour et le voici" to "Ainsi vont toutes choses," a choice as amusing as it is arbitrary, since the latter element, found in section A, is confronted on the manuscript by no less than three octosyllables, and if aligned with a straightedge, would follow the former element. This arrangement, although quite consistent with the other syntax of the traditional version, makes little more poetic or grammatical sense.

It is highly probable that Apollinaire wished to preserve the lyric and the metaphysical, the octosyllabic and the duodecasyllabic sections of his poem intact. It is less certain, although still probable, that he wished to insert the twelve marginal lines between lines three and four of section A. This is indicated by the riming of "droite" and "délicate" and by the very subject matter, which is embarrassed by the happy emigrants who have bleeding hearts. Were the twelve lines inserted in the place indicated, then line four of section A would function as the transition between the

two sections, while the interrupted rime "respirent-souvenirs" would be repaired by the remaining "souvenirs-d'Ophir." In section B the rimes "disait-brisé" (not unusual for Apollinaire), "hommes-comme" and "voici-aussi" would be thus restored to their rightful sequence.

The question remaining, after the determination to make such adjustments, is a serious one: if, as has been indicated, the poem was published in June, 1917, fully eighteen months before the poet's premature death, how is it that he did not specify his wishes in the correction of the proofs? Or perhaps the manuscript in question is merely the rough draft of which Apollinaire made a copy for the *Nord-Sud* staff. The answer to the latter problem must come from someone other than the present writer, who has been unable to determine the existence of another manuscript. In reply to the former, detailed examination of the marginal verses confirms that if the poet saw any proofs at all, he failed to make them conform to his own manuscript corrections.³

Line one of section B first read "C'est la chanson des rêveurs," which is the reading retained traditionally. Apollinaire, however, clearly, if incompletely, indicated that "rêveurs" was to be modified to the singular: he corrected the word with a large "r" and inserted the "ce." This revision is incomplete, however, for he failed to correct "des" to "de" in the same line. The traditional rendition, in failing to take notice of this, has fixed the line in a seven syllable form, the avoidance of which was undoubtedly one of the poet's reasons for the revision. He also neglected the following verb, leaving it in the plural, but remembered to change "portaient" to "portait." His over-all intention is confirmed in the following lines of the same section, in the "le rêveur" who "disait." It is thus doubtful that the author of *Alcools* saw his poem in the proof form before its appearance in *Nord-Sud*.

The other differences between the traditional reading and the one proposed here are supported by evidence in the facsimile. The addition of "choses" to the line "Ainsi vont toutes" is problematical, but may be admitted for reasons of rime. It certainly has no justification in the handwritten version.

In accordance with the foregoing suggestions, the following is

³ Due to war conditions prevailing at that time, it is possible that proofs were not made by reviews, whose very existence was rather precarious.

Sanglots

Or nous savons qu'en nous beaucoup d'hommes
qui vivaient de bons Louis et tout un sauve les
fronts

9 ans s'est basant sur les données
 16 points de données sur les données

Souvenirs - t-en cher ou qu'il de tous ces souvenirs

Des concubins des marins qui
Des marins qui chantaient comme des coqs
Des quaffres de Thulé des bandes vicieuses
Des malades maudits de ceux qui finissent

[illegible]

the version proposed as a contribution to a definitive reading of the poem:⁴

SANGLOTS

Notre amour est réglé par les calmes étoiles

Or nous savons qu'en nous beaucoup d'hommes respirent
Qui vinrent de très loin et sont un sous nos fronts

C'est la chanson de ce rêveur
Qui s'était arraché le cœur
Et le portait dans la main droite
De ce cœur il coulait du sang
Et le rêveur allait pensant
A sa blessure délicate
Et douloureuse et nous disait
Mon pauvre cœur mon cœur brisé
Pareil au cœur de tous les hommes
Est mort d'amour ou c'est tout comme
Est mort d'amour et le voici
Arrachez donc le vôtre aussi

Souviens-t'en cher orgueil de tous ces souvenirs
Des marins qui chantaient comme des conquérants
Des gouffres de Thulé des tendres cieux d'Ophir
Des malades maudits de ceux qui fuient leur ombre
Et du retour joyeux des heureux émigrants

Tu ne la briseras la chaîne de ces causes
Qui sont les effets d'autres causes

Voici voici nos mains que la vie fit esclaves

Ainsi vont toutes [choses]

Et rien ne sera libre jusqu'à la fin des temps
Laissons tout aux morts
Et cachons nos sanglots.

JOHN W. CAMERON

Indiana University

⁴ All punctuation is suppressed, even if found on the manuscript, in conformity with another editorial tradition. This policy, based on the poet's like treatment of the proofs of *Alcools* and all his following verses, affects the printed versions of poems written even years before 1912. Cf. Apollinaire, *Le Guetteur mélancolique* (Gallimard, 1952).

TYPES OF RECURRING SIMILES IN MALRAUX'S NOVELS

While collecting examples for a linguistic study of the expression of comparison, I was struck by the large number of cards obtained from an examination of the novels of André Malraux;¹ 1,220 similes were noted in 1,270 pages of text—a high rate compared with the corresponding figures for works by other contemporary novelists.²

An attempt to classify Malraux's similes according to their content showed a large proportion of cases in which an abstract element is present. Moreover, that proportion increases in successive novels: almost a third of the similes in *Les Conquérants* are abstract; in *La Voie royale*, half; in *La Condition humaine*, two thirds; in *Le Temps du mépris*, over half.³ This progression corresponds to an increasing preoccupation with metaphysical problems. "Le roman idéologique succède au roman-reportage. . ."⁴ Beneath the accumulation of violent incident and the variety of setting, all these novels are based on the same moral problem—man's struggle against loneliness, humiliation, and the final enemy: death. Malraux's men of action—adventurers and revolutionaries—display a peculiar fondness for analysing their own motives as well as those of their friends and adversaries. It is usually in order to render their thoughts and feelings that the author uses imagery of the kind now to be examined. In some cases the comparison is wholly abstract; in other similes an idea or an impression is compared with something concrete. Of both these types each book contains

¹ *Les Conquérants* (abbreviated *C*), Paris, Grasset, 1928; *La Voie royale* (*Vr*), Grasset, 1930; *La Condition humaine* (*Ch*), Paris, Gallimard, 1933; *Le Temps du mépris* (*Tm*), Gallimard, 1935; *L'Espoir* (*E*), Gallimard, 1937. For *C*, *Ch*, and *E*, references are to pages of the Pléiade volume (André Malraux, *Romans*, Gallimard, 1947).

² For example, Albert Camus, *La Peste*, Gallimard, 1947, in which similes occur at an average rate of two for eleven pages.

³ In *L'Espoir*, however, only one simile in four has an abstract basis; the rest are used to illustrate narrative and description in that long and crowded work.

⁴ Pierre de Boisdeffre, *Métamorphose de la Littérature de Barrès à Malraux*, Paris, Editions Alsatia, 1950, p. 350.

numerous examples which are remarkably similar in tone and matter. Grouped below according to their affinities, they show the frequent recurrence of certain themes—physical suffering, torture, death—which reflect Malraux's outlook during the second half of *l'entre-deux-guerres*.

His obsession with death is responsible for a score of similes, in most of which it is conveyed by reference to the physical aspect of death (for example, *noyé, cadavre, squelette*) :

Les pilotes s'écartaient de lui comme d'une agonie d'enfant (*E* 478); il était en face d'elle comme d'une agonie; et comme vers une agonie, l'instinct le jetait vers elle (*Ch* 200); l'immobilité sans retour, là, à côté de ce corps qui l'avait relié à l'univers, était comme un suicide de Dieu (*Ch* 397); Le pas du garde s'éloignait, sourdement répercuté dans le couloir, monotone comme tous les sons funèbres (*Tm* 48); Le monde reprenait possession de lui comme d'un noyé (*Vr* 127); Il fallait ramener quelque chose dans ce cadavre, comme dans un noyé qu'on masse (*Vr* 175); cette joie de s'abandonner soi-même, de laisser sur la grève, comme le corps d'un compagnon noyé, cet être, lui-même, dont il fallait chaque jour réinventer la vie (*Ch* 335); une angoisse qui protégeait avec une force de cadavre ces figures dont le geste séculaire régnait sur une cour de mille-pattes et de bêtes des ruines (*Vr* 115); à la fois enchaîné à sa chair et séparé d'elle, comme ces hommes que l'on noyait après les avoir liés à des cadavres (*Vr* 226); ce Grabot qui continuait à tourner dans la case comme autour du cadavre de son courage (*Vr* 192); De nouveau, combattre. Et pourtant, tout ce qu'il avait fait était devant lui comme son propre cadavre (*Vr* 242); Toucher ce corps immobile était aussi difficile que frapper un cadavre, peut-être pour les mêmes raisons (*Ch* 167); Il lui revenait en vérité du fond de la mort, étranger comme l'un des cadavres des fosses communes (*Ch* 415); un chant flamenco monta: guttural, intense, il tenait du chant funèbre et du cri désespéré des caravaniers. Et il semblait se crisper sur la ville et l'odeur des cadavres comme les mains des tués se crispent dans la terre (*E* 519); tout ce qui allait une fois de plus l'écraser ainsi qu'un couvercle de cercueil vissé sur un vivant (*Ch* 368-369); Manuel ouvrit la porte, hésita une seconde, comme si refermer cette porte eût été rabattre le couvercle d'un cercueil sur le blessé (*E* 495); Tout ce qu'il avait pensé de la vie se décomposait sous la fièvre comme un corps dans la terre (*Vr* 259); la vie des Stiengs chassés emplissait les profondeurs dont elle n'émergeait pas, comme une suprême décomposition (*Vr* 236); la Voie Royale ne menait plus qu'aux vestiges que laissent derrière elles, tels des ossements, les migrations et les armées (*Vr* 106); Promesses ou refus, ces monuments abandonnés par la forêt comme des squelettes? (*Vr* 97-98); Kassner se sentait avancer comme un squelette brisé secoué par le chant (*Tm* 58).

Another and bigger group comprises comparisons suggested by

illness and physical disabilities. Here again, as in the examples quoted above, one finds certain terms reappearing in successive novels:

penser à la mort même avec une indulgence sans limites, comme à quelque paralytique qui lui eût voulu du mal (*Ch* 397); Vivre en veilleuse, comme les paralysés, comme les agonisants (*Tm* 46); Mais ce cadran qui tournait . . . exprimait la vie de l'appareil comme l'œil resté vivant exprime la vie d'un paralytique (*Tm* 138); Il demeurerait, contemplant le mouvement des autos, des passants . . . , comme un aveugle guéri regarde, comme un affamé mange (*Ch* 168-169); Son dessein, tant qu'il l'avait supporté seul, l'avait retranché du monde, lié à un univers incommunicable comme celui de l'aveugle ou du fou (*Vr* 57); Leclerc, attaché à l'avion du chef de groupe, dans le déchainement général, comme un aveugle à son conducteur, possédé par le sentiment de ne plus faire qu'un avec lui (*E* 652); ce monde ignoble et attirant à la fois comme le regard des idiots (*Vr* 100); Sous la fraternité des armes . . . , il sentait la rupture possible comme il eût senti la menace de la crise chez un ami épileptique ou fou, au moment de sa plus grande lucidité (*Ch* 258); la force de l'ennemi qui parvenait à le rejeter de la fatalité du monde, comme les fous et les morts (*Tm* 48).

In some cases Malraux is content to use a general term (*malade*, *maladie*), but more often he chooses a precise image which is highly suggestive of the impression to be conveyed:

Claude sombrait comme dans une maladie dans cette fermentation où les formes se gonflaient, s'allongeaient, pourrissaient hors du monde dans lequel l'homme compte (*Vr* 98); Cet amour souvent crispé qui les unissait comme un enfant malade (*Ch* 198); Comme un malade choisit pour parler de la mort un autre malade, Manuel parlait d'un drame moral avec un homme à qui ce monde était familier (*E* 759); Il considère sa vie comme pourrait le faire un phthisique encore plein de force, mais sans espoir (*C* 105); "Ceux qui sont trop profondément tombés dans la misère n'en sortent jamais: ils s'y dissolvent comme s'ils avaient la lèpre" (*C* 144); l'homme décomposé par son espoir trompé comme par une tumeur (*Vr* 20); accepter vivant la vanité de son existence, comme un cancer, vivre avec cette tiédeur de mort dans la main (*Vr* 55); "Toutes ses anciennes espérances de femme jeune se sont mises à miner sa vie comme une syphilis attrapée dans l'adolescence,—et la mienne par contagion" (*Vr* 85); une anxiété plus écœurante, semblable à ces demi-pertes de conscience qui précèdent les vomissements (*Vr* 242); Ce masque intelligent qui d'expression en expression revenait à Kassner comme un évanoui revient à la vie (*Tm* 177); cette fumée de cigarettes nerveusement allumées, où l'espoir se débattait comme quelqu'un qui étouffe (*E* 460); nous retrouvons la chaleur, comme une plaie (*C* 88); un sourire paralysé qu'il sentait tendre la peau de son visage comme une plaie qui se referme (*Tm* 169); Même victorieux, il retrouverait en sortant un monde à jamais amputé, il porterait comme

une cicatrice cette mort solitaire (*Tm* 48); l'espoir une fois de plus s'en allait, une fausse dernière fois, comme la fausse dernière vague de sang chassée d'une blessure par l'irrépressible pulsation du cœur (*Tm* 66); Dépendance, abandon de la volonté, de la chair même. Comme si le sang, pulsation à pulsation, s'écoulait (*Vr* 124); La ville se vidait comme un corps perd son sang (*E* 622).

The final list is made up of similes based on references to torture and violence; they serve to heighten the atmosphere of physical and mental suffering which characterizes these works:

Elle l'avait atteint à son point le plus sensible, comme si elle lui eût crevé les yeux pendant son sommeil (*Ch* 323); la sueur qui coulait sur les visages et formait avec la poussière du grès, sous les lunettes noires, de longues rigoles, comme sous des yeux arrachés (*Vr* 122-123); "et puis les indigènes des derniers villages sont impaludés jusqu'au gâtisme, les paupières bleues comme si on cognait dessus depuis huit jours" (*Vr* 38); à la fois enchaîné à sa chair et séparé d'elle, comme ces hommes que l'on noyait après les avoir liés à des cadavres (*Vr* 226); A côté de lui, Claude qui allait vivre, qui croyait à la vie comme d'autres croient que les bourreaux qui vous torturent sont des hommes (*Vr* 262); Cette fois, ils n'étaient pas là avec leurs bras écartés, mais immobiles comme une délégation indifférente envoyée par la torture même avec son timbre assourdi de fatalité (*Tm* 63); les gardes . . . haletaient sous leur costume raide, comme des garrottés en uniforme (*E* 487).⁵

In his thesis on Flaubert, René Dumesnil wrote: "C'est surtout par les comparaisons et les images que le style d'un écrivain peut nous renseigner sur sa 'mentalité.'" ⁶ It is hoped that the classification adopted for the examples quoted above does this to some extent for Malraux's thought, by showing his constant preoccupation with certain aspects of "la condition humaine." Regarding the stylistic rôle of these similes it must be said that they do little to relieve the density of Malraux's prose, which Henri Clouard has

⁵ In *Les Noyers de l'Altenburg*, Gallimard, 1948, which is hardly a novel but rather a philosophical discussion, similes are used as frequently as in the pre-war novels, and the abstract again outnumber the concrete (by three to two); but this work offers very few examples relevant to the present study: "Et Friedrich [Nietzsche] bien plus inquiétant qu'un cadavre" (97); "Mon père écoutait, regardait Wurtz devenir moraliste. . . . Comme on regarde un fou auquel on ressemble un peu" (180); "L'angoisse des soldats s'était tassée sans disparaître, comme une maladie aiguë devient chronique" (184); "le temps militaire, le temps transparent qui ne dépend que des ordres supérieurs—comme la mort" (200).

⁶ *Flaubert: son hérité, son milieu, sa méthode*, Paris [1905], p. 264.

described as having "le volume des paquets de mer par gros temps sur le pont du navire."⁷ Indeed, the difficulty of this style is often due to the abruptness with which the imagery switches from the concrete to the abstract.

G. O. REES

The University of Liverpool

LETTERS OF LAFON TO NAPOLEON, TALMA, AND OTHERS

The Johns Hopkins University acquired in 1952 some fifty documents concerning the distinguished French actor, Pierre Lafon.¹ The first of them is a contract signed on March 15, 1797, by Pierre Lafond, "artiste du théâtre de Nice," and Michel Corneille, director of the troupe. The engagement runs until the Saturday before Palm Sunday, 1798. Lafon is to have the "premier rôle" in tragedies, comedies, and *dramas*, or, if there is no first role, that of "jeune premier." He agrees to supply his own costumes, apart from exceptional cases, and to abide by the regulations of the police. He receives 2000 francs a year in specie and half the proceeds of a winter performance, perhaps also a gratification. The director will pay traveling expenses and advances him 300 francs that will be deducted from his salary. Note the contrast between what he makes this year and what he will be paid in the provinces after his reputation has been established.

In Paris he won the protection of Lucien Bonaparte, thanks to whose influence, added to that of Dugazon, who gave him lessons in acting, he was allowed to make his début at the reorganized

⁷ *Histoire de la Littérature française, du Symbolisme à nos jours*, T. II: *De 1915 à 1940*, Paris, Albin Michel, 1949, p. 314.

¹ Cf. Lyonnet, *Dictionnaire des Comédiens Français*, Paris, n. d., II, 262-5. The documents confirm the date and place of birth indicated by Lyonnet (Lalinde in Dordogne, Sept. 1, 1773), add that Gertrude Dretchêne was his mother's name, and show that he wrote his own "Lafond" until some time in the eighteen-twenties. Mrs. C. A. Kyrle Fletcher, who sold the collection to the Johns Hopkins, informs me that it came from the widow of Dr. Guillet, "official doctor to the Chamber of Deputies," whose mother was the actor's niece.

Comédie Française on May 8, 1800, playing Achilles in Racine's *Iphigénie*. Such was his success that he received from Napoleon an invitation "pour aller dîner chez lui aux tuileries après mes débuts à son retour de Maringo."²

On September 28, 1800, he received from Mahéroult, who directed for the government the affairs of the theater, a letter with two enclosures giving him the right to be received as a member of the troupe. Since there was no vacancy, he was paid a salary in 1800 and in 1801.³ He soon found, however, that it was not enough to be a member of the troupe. It was necessary to struggle in order to be given the kind of role he had played before coming to Paris and while he was being tested at the Comédie Française. He carried his complaint to no less a person than the First Consul himself.

Au Citoyen Bonaparte
Premier Consul
citoyen consul,

vous daignerez peut-être vous rappeler que *lafond*, débutant à la comédie française depuis huit mois, a eu le bonheur d'être l'objet de vos encouragements pour l'art dramatique, admis à l'honneur de dîner avec vous il y a quelques mois, fier de cette faveur, il y a puisé un puissant motif de mériter de plus en plus votre bienveillance. citoyen consul, oserai-je la réclamer encore en vous confiant, comme à un père, (les artistes vous appellent ainsi,) les chagrins que me donnent depuis plus de deux mois l'inaction dangereuse où l'on me fait languir et l'intrigue de mes ennemis.

peu satisfait de m'ôter la faculté de paraître quelques fois dans les rôles, où vous même avez daigné m'accueillir, sous les prétextes les plus faux et les plus perfides, on veut, pour anéantir entièrement mon existence théâtrale, me réduire aux plus bas emplois, lorsque j'ai été jugé capable de me maintenir dans le premier, en travaillant avec courage.

je sais, citoyen consul, tout ce que je dois de déférence aux *cens* talma et larive mes deux anciens; mais est-il juste, comme l'exige de moi le com-

² Indicated in a note written by Lafon to accompany "papiers précieux" few if any of which have remained in the collection: letters written to Lafon by Lucien Bonaparte, his replies, letters from Napoleon's sister, Mme Bacciochi, and the invitation just mentioned. The names of Mahéroult and Dugazon are written in the margin of the note, as if there were also letters from them.

³ Lyonnet says that he received 3600 francs upon entrance, which seems to mean from September, 1800, to Easter, 1801; 7200 in 1801, that is, to Easter, 1802; a fourth of a share in 1802; three-fourths in 1803; seven-eighths in 1807. One of the documents shows that he was promised the remaining eighth on July 9, 1808.

missaire du gouvernement (le *c^m* Mahérault) que je serve de piedestal et de double aux derniers confidens? le gouvernement qui m'a comblé de ses largesses a-t-il prétendu encourager et récompenser un simple accessoire de tragédie? mais qui, mieux que vous, citoyen consul, sait ce qu'est l'amour de la gloire; on le réchauffe sans doute par les obstacles; mais dans les arts on l'éteint, en détournant un artiste d'obéir à sa destinée.

autrefois à la comédie française, tous les vendredis étaient réservés aux doubles pour y jouer des rôles à leur choix: daignez exiger, citoyen consul, que sur quatre jours de tragédie par décade, il y en ait un au moins de destiné aux jeunes artistes, qui, ayant eu le bonheur de mériter les encouragemens du public et du premier chef du gouvernement, ont besoin d'être soutenus, en paraissant quelques fois; pour dernière faveur, fixez, citoyen consul, fixez, je vous en conjure, mon sort à la comédie française, en ordonnant que je ne me déplace que dans des rôles convenables, pour l'intérêt des tragédies, et en établissant ma place après les *c^ms* Larive et Talma.

vous frère, le ministre de l'intérieur, m'honorait de sa protection, l'accueil que j'ai reçu de vous m'a permis d'espérer l'honneur de la votre. je devrai mon sort à votre respectable maison et la plus vive et la plus durable reconnaissance sera le prix de tant de bienfaits.

je suis avec respect et dévouement,
citoyen consul,

votre zélé serviteur.

lafond artiste de la comédie française

Paris ce 6 Nivose an 9^e.

P.S. Si j'osais vous demander une audience, citoyen consul, je pourrais vous faire mieux connaître ma situation actuelle à la comédie française.

In another letter to Napoleon he continues to complain, asserting that he has been allowed to act only twice in two months. For the third performance of *Venceslas* he has been offered a role that belongs to Saint-Fal or Damas, one that he has been told that Napoleon wants him to play. Of course he will play it if the Consul insists, but he dislikes to take it from his comrades. He asks to replace Talma when he is ill and to be allowed to play a first role at least once a fortnight.

The reference to the role that belongs to Saint-Fal or Damas is probably to that of the duc de Courlande, for he wrote to Mahérault that the actors had offered him the role of Alexandre in *Venceslas*,⁴ though it should be acted by a youngster like Dupont or Armand, and that he considered that the only characters in the play suitable

⁴ In *Venceslas* there are only three male roles that have over two hundred verses; the longest is that of Ladislas; the next that of Venceslas, an elderly role; the third that of the duc de Courlande.

for him to represent were Ladislav and the duc de Courlande. He added that Larive or Talma would play Ladislav and that one of his "anciens" had chosen the duc de Courlande. Mahéault must have insisted, however, for Lafon wrote him a second letter to thank him for the duc de Courlande and to beg him to explain to the actors that he had had nothing to do with obtaining the role.

That he had been accused of intriguing is obvious from this letter and others, written to Lucien Bonaparte, Roederer, and the actors. He complained also to Chaptal after he succeeded Lucien as Minister of the Interior. Meanwhile Lafon had received on March 20, 1801, an invitation to a ball in celebration of peace, given by the Minister of War. Of greater interest is a letter that Lafon wrote to Talma, apparently in 1803.

Mon cher T. la bonne intelligence que je me suis toujours efforcé de maintenir entre nous deux, la franchise de mes procédés envers toi et la déférence que j'ai et veux toujours avoir pour mon ancien, comme je desirais qu'on l'ait pour moi-même, me déterminent à t'exposer sans détour le chagrin réel que me cause la distinction de ton nom sur l'affiche.

destiné seul à te suppléer au théâtre français, cette distinction, dont ton talent peut se passer, me frappe d'une manière directe et semble avertir le gros du public que quand je joue il peut s'abstenir du spectacle. de quelque philosophie dont nous soyons doués dans notre état, notre amour propre ne peut s'accommoder de ce qui le blesse, ou l'humilie même légèrement; je dirai mieux, c'est lui seul qui nous porte à braver toutes les tribulations, toutes les angoisses qu'entraîne toujours la nécessité de se livrer aux jugements du public, souvent plus capricieux qu'équitable. je t'ai vu toi-même, et avec juste raison, mépriser cette manie de se faire annoncer; tu n'en étais pas moins suivi, moins justement admiré et je puis te confesser avec toute la sincérité d'un galant homme que je n'ai jamais murmuré de tes grands succès. j'ai toujours regardé comme une part assez consolante pour moi de remplacer un homme à talent, sans essayer la défaveur publique. Mon utilité au théâtre est hautement reconnue et il est dans mes principes d'honneur de la faire tourner toute entière au profit de ma société. mais si par le moyen que tu as employé tu la paralyse, sans aucun profit pour toi, si je me trouve déprécié dans l'opinion, tu portes atteinte, sans le vouloir, à ma petite réputation, à mes intérêts pécuniaires et à ceux de la comédie. il faut, mon cher Talma, pour le bien de tous que le public ait du plaisir à nous voir tous les deux. au reste, mon ami, je ne récriminerais point sur cet objet si tous les chefs d'emploi jouissaient sur l'affiche de la distinction que tu t'y donnes et à laquelle, je le sais, t'ont presque forcé des sociétaires bien mal éclairés sur leurs vrais intérêts: je dis bien mal éclairés; ils seront les premiers à en souffrir, si le dégoût s'empare de moi, au lieu de huit ou dix représentations où je suis indispensable, je suffirai tout au plus à trois ou quatre. c'est ainsi qu'on t'a fait la cour à tes dépens, aux miens et à ceux du corps en général.

tu as fait une longue et cruelle maladie, tu as eu huit ou dix congés, sans que j'aie pu jamais en obtenir un seul,⁴ j'ai fait ton service et le mien, j'ai suffi à tout sans te faire oublier et sans en avoir ni le désir ni la pensée, & quand bien même j'en aurais eu le pouvoir. pourquoi seul de tous les acteurs du théâtre français, serais-je humilié par une distinction, dont encore une fois tu n'as nul besoin pour ta gloire? tu joues quand tu veux, les pièces qui te conviennent, et avec les distributions qui te plaisent, le public te chérit, tes amis te pronent avec un enthousiasme qui t'est du, tu as la faveur du prince, je suis ton vassal à brunoï⁵ et à Paris, rien ne manque à ton bonheur, laisse moi jouir un peu du mien qui comme tu sais n'est pas excessif; laisse m'en jouir, sans mortification et par tant sans inquiétude.

j'ai pensé, mon ami, qu'il valait mieux m'ouvrir franchement à toi, que de nous livrer aux caquetages, aux plaintes et à la crierie, je sais que tu es un bon garçon avec qui l'on peut s'expliquer; il y a beaucoup de gens qui s'offusquent de notre bonne intelligence; mais en dépit d'eux je ferai tous mes efforts pour la maintenir et serai toujours moi-même et ton ami et ton admirateur

ton lieutenant lafond.

On July 31, 1804, Lafon received a cordial letter from Piis, author of vaudevilles and secretary of the prefecture of police. He regrets having been away when Lafon called and hopes to receive him at his home:

Nous y ferons ensemble l'inauguration d'un *Apollon* que l'artiste coësson me Sculpte. nous chanterons, nous déclamerons & je m'en rejouis à l'avance
Salut au nom du dieu précité

Piis.

Luce de Lancival's *Hector* was played on February 1, 1809. In preparation for the performance the dramatist asked Lafon to take the role of Pâris, which he declined to do, but he offered to play Hector if Talma gave up this role.

On May 23, 1810, Lafon was invited by Napoleon's sister, the grand duchess of Tuscany, to come "chez elle samedi à sept heures du soir pour lui faire la lecture de la tragédie de M^r renouard." The play in question was undoubtedly Raynouard's *Templiers*, in which Lafon was playing the part of Philippe le Bel.

Several documents promise Lafon a "traitement extraordinaire."

⁴ This shows that the letter was written before April 20, 1804, when Lafon obtained his first leave. He was to visit Gironde and return when summoned.

⁵ Talma purchased an estate at Brunoy in Seine-et-Oise.

The amount for 1811 was 2400 francs; for 1812 and for 1813 it was 1800 francs; for 1815, after April 1, it was 300 francs a month. It is doubtful if he was able to collect after Waterloo. In 1811 he gave ten performances at Lyons, playing every other day and supplying his own costumes. He received 600 francs a performance plus 24 francs a day for expenses and 600 francs for the trip. He was given half the receipts of an eleventh performance and played in a twelfth "au bénéfice de l'entreprise." He went on to Marseilles, where he had a similar contract except that there was no twelfth performance. On his way back he played again at Lyons, so that he was away from Paris for more than two months and received a reprimand and an order to hasten back to the capital. He also acted at Bordeaux. In view of his complaint that Talma allowed his name to appear prominently on posters, it is amusing to find a printed announcement that on September 26, 1814, in the Grand Théâtre the role of Orosmane in *Zaïre* would be played by "M. LAFONT, premier Acteur tragique du théâtre Français, pensionnaire du Roi et professeur au conservatoire royal." No suggestion that Talma was still active.

Lafon had now become an important actor with plenty of opportunities to play major roles, but he had not as yet been able to silence criticism. He was obliged to defend himself against the gossip of certain actors⁶ and the criticism of the journalist, Martainville. He delivered orations, however, over the tombs of Monvel and Talma⁷ and could communicate rather haughtily to authors, as his letter to Pichat shows when, after Talma's death, this dramatist asked him to replace him in *Léonidas*. Between his retirement in 1831 and his death in 1846 the documents chiefly concern his son, Achille, a second lieutenant, and his daughter, a painter. It is interesting to note that he gave lessons in diction to the Belgian historian and statesman, Joseph Kervyn de Lettenhove.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

⁶ In a letter of July 3, 1817, mentioned in the *Amateur d'autographes*, XIII, 11, 12, and now in this collection.

⁷ The first is given in one of the documents; the second was published at Paris in 1826.

THE ANAGRAM IN *LE ROUGE ET LE NOIR*

In Chapter Five of *le Rouge et le noir* Julien Sorel before going for the first time to the Rênals' house stops for a moment in the church of Verrières. Here in this recently built edifice, so decisive in determining his career and so important in destroying it, there occurs a little incident which at first glance is amusing and foreboding, but which on further reflection is rather puzzling. Julien, as he enters the church, is moved by the dark religious atmosphere, as he always was in churches, contrary to his hypocrisy. This time he is especially impressed because the church is decorated in red for some special occasion. Julien walks up to one of the stalls, which turns out to be M. de Rênal's, and comes upon a torn fragment of printed paper which he picks up and reads. It says, "*Détails de l'exécution et des derniers moments de Louis Jenrel, exécuté à Besançon le. . .*" And on the reverse it says "*Le premier pas.*" Julien wonders who might have put the paper there, and says, "Pauvre malheureux, son nom finit comme le mien." He crumples the piece of paper in his hand, and strides out of the church. But as he is leaving he is badly frightened by the reflection of the light shining through the red curtains on some spilled holy water, which he takes at first for blood.¹

This premonitory scene, with its juxtaposition of the redness of the holy water and the blackness of the church, has been remarked upon more than once. Maurice Bardèche, for instance, sees it as a conventionally romantic *présage* after the fashion of the novel of the twenties;² Martineau and others notice the color symbolism.³ But the *spirit* in which the scene is written has mostly escaped the commentators. This is important because the scene provides a valuable clue to the understanding of two major aspects of the *Rouge*. One of these aspects is: the attitude toward the story taken by Stendhal and so presumably required of the reader; the

¹ And they rose up early in the morning and the sun shone upon the water and the Moabites saw the water on the other side as red as blood. And they said, this is blood, etc. (II Kings, 3, 22-23).

² *Stendhal romancier*, Paris, 1947, p. 222; see also Bardèche's *Balzac romancier*, Paris, 1940.

³ In his edition of the *Rouge*, Paris, Garnier, 1950, note 36.

other aspect has to do with one of the main moving forces of the action: the "powers that be."

Taking the first aspect: the scene in question is not merely premonitory in a suggestive way, through the notice of the execution and the redness of the holy water (the red decoration will be there still, or again, when Mme de Rênal is shot); it is premonitory in the most absolute sense. Louis Jenrel is quite simply an anagram for Julien Sorel.

Now this little fact creates some big difficulties. Unless we can suppose that Julien's father, or the abbé Chélan, or Julien's good friend Fouqué went to the trouble of having this piece of paper printed up (Stendhal is careful to tell us that it is printed) and "planted" as a warning to Julien—in which case they would have had to know beforehand that Julien would go into the church and to M. Rênal's stall, there is positively no way of explaining this anagram except as an arbitrary and playful bit of spoofing by Stendhal. Anyone familiar with the *Chartreuse* (where, incidentally, Stendhal plays more elaborately with the convention of the *présage*) should find it very hard to believe that Stendhal would *inadvertently* fall into romantic claptrap. It is equally hard to believe that Stendhal, fond as he was of the anagram, would resort to it merely in order to invent a proper name. The anagram, however you look at it, is bald: Stendhal invites the reader now to take a double attitude toward the whole story of Julien, and to watch for further signals from the author. Certainly the tale should be absorbing, but at the same time it should be amusing and amused, in that involved, subtle and ironic way which is so specially Stendhal's. And this leads to the second aspect which is illuminated by the scene of the anagram.

Julien is a hero, but of a peculiar sort, at once traditional and unique. He is a hero in quotation marks, an absurd *petit paysan*, "notre héros";⁴ but he is also a rebel against society, a potential criminal—indeed he is Julien as most critics like to think of him. He is, in short, both the bitter Figaro and Cherubino *adoncino d'amor*.⁵ Yet Julien is even more. The scene of the anagram suggests that he is the hero of a larger drama.

This larger drama is the conflict between the calculating will on

⁴ Ed. cit., p. 81 and elsewhere.

⁵ See the epigraph for Ch. VI.

the one hand and *l'imprévu* or *le hasard* on the other. Julien thinks he is coldly pitting his hypocritical calculation against a society which he despises (ignorantly and, as it turns out, unjustly) but envies. And yet what success he has he owes not at all to his own planning, but to the uncalculating sympathy for him which he creates in others. His maladroit seduction of Mme de Rênal is an example of this. Moreover Chélan, Pirard, the Marquis, and at the end almost all the rest help him or try to help him. But what creates this sympathy is precisely the unpremeditated part of Julien's actions. At one point Stendhal explains that Julien would have managed perfectly well "*sans cette sottise de faire un plan,*" but that nevertheless Mme de Rênal saw in his ineptitude merely "*l'effet d'une candeur charmante.*"⁶

Stendhal's intentions along these lines are convincingly indicated by the very important role he assigned to *l'imprévu* both in his Hobbesian theory of laughter⁷ and in *De l'amour*⁸ with his distinction between *amour-goût* where all is calculation, and the so much more exciting *amour-passion*, where all is *imprévu* and where the agent is the patient. Julien's relationships with Mme de Rênal and with Mathilde de la Mole provide amusing examples of both kinds, yet with *l'imprévu* and *le hasard* always the deciding forces. For instance Julien's uncalculated gesture of seizing the sword from the wall as though to kill Mathilde had made a favorable impression on her, but the scene had left him in despair and powerless to act; yet, Stendhal observes, only that very lack of *savoir-faire*, so painful to Julien at this particular moment, had permitted the previous "*mouvement sublime*" of seizing the sword.⁹

Instances such as this one abound,¹⁰ and the references to the similar and often related operation of *le hasard* are just as frequent.¹¹

The fact is, then, that the whole novel is carried along by forces which are unpredictable and uncontrollable. But the really im-

⁶ Ed. cit., p. 81.

⁷ *Racine et Shakespeare*, ed. Champion, II, 133 ff.

⁸ Ed. Champion, vol. II, p. 145.

⁹ *Rouge*, ed. Martineau, p. 349.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 43, 66, 86, 264, 280, 343, 403, 405, etc.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 21, 43, 54, 64, 78, 148, 311, 327, 355, 365, 385, 408, 419, 496, etc.

portant point is that these forces are *recognised as existing*, and as having their own plans. The anagram lets us in on the secret, so to speak. These forces are far more powerful and inscrutable than "society." The sum of them may be called chance, or it may be called Providence. That Stendhal was aware of the possibility of confusing or identifying the two terms is made clear by the following little scene between Julien and Pirard. Says Julien,

— J'ai été hâï de mon père depuis le berceau; c'était un de mes grands malheurs; je ne me plaindrai plus du hasard, j'ai retrouvé un père en vous monsieur.

— C'est bon, c'est bon, dit l'abbé embarrassé, puis rencontrant fort à propos un mot de directeur de séminaire: il ne faut jamais dire le hasard, mon enfant, dites toujours la Providence.¹²

Julien had his chance to interpret the oracle (or to listen to the voice of Providence) in the anagram. But, even in spite of his moment of exaltation and fear (which suggests that he may have been every bit as religious as he pretended to be), he cried instead his absurdly boyish cry, "Aux armes!", and went out to begin his campaign. He did not know that the power he was challenging to this game had an infinity of counters; he did not know that he was proposing to re-order the elements of an existence already disposed of, even then irrevocably spelled out, in which comic or tragic transpositions and reversals (processes of the anagram) were therefore to play such a capricious and fateful part. This is the most compelling of several reasons for calling *le Rouge et le noir* a Jansenist novel.

E. B. O. BORGERHOFF

Princeton University

MORE ABOUT IDENTITY OF MIÇER FRANCISCO IMPERIAL

The only biographical data which we may accept as self-evident in the life of Francisco Imperial are those contained in the headings of his poems in the *Cancionero de Baena*. Only three of these headings do more than identify him as the author or set forth the occasion or circumstances of the respective poem. The three

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 236.

headings with additional details are those of the poems numbered 226, 521, and 548 in the Pidal-Ochoa edition of the *Cancionero*.¹ Nos. 521 and 548 record the author as Miçer Francisco Imperial, "natural de Genova, estante morador" of Seville; No. 226 shows him as "miçer Francisco Ynperial, natural de Jenova, estante e morador que fue en la muy noble çibdat de Sevilla." What others have said about the life of Imperial—and this largely surmise in so far as it goes beyond the contents of the above-mentioned headings—has been adequately summarized by E. B. Place in his article entitled "The Exaggerated Reputation of Francisco Imperial" in *Speculum* XXI (1946), 459.

I shall now set forth my own views concerning the identity of Miçer Francisco Imperial. For this purpose let us first define the Italian title *messere*, of which *miçer* is an adaptation, using for our definition the following excerpt from G. Boccardo:² "Il Parisi (Istruzioni, tomo III, p. 39) conferma che negli scrittori de' secoli XIV e XV il titolo di Messere era onorifico, e importava generalmente dottore o cavaliere ne' secolari, e graduato negli ecclesiastici eziandio regolari." Thus, in Imperial's time the title could be held by the religious.

I contend that Miçer Francisco was a religious and I adduce the following evidence in corroboration of my contention: (1) In the *Dezir a las syete virtudes*³ Imperial displays an extensive knowledge of theology, a knowledge which could scarcely be expected of a layman. (2) The fifth verse⁴ of the last octave of the aforesaid *Dezir* tends to indicate that Imperial's hair may have been shorn in accordance with the practice of the monastic tonsure. (3) Most significant of all: Imperial seems to be none other than the Fray Migir of Ochoa's No. 38 of the *Cancionero de Baena*. This latter poem, according to its heading, was composed by "Fray Migir de la orden de Sant Jeronimo, capellan del onrado obispo de Segovia Don Juan de Tordesyllas quando fynó el dicho señor Rey Enrryque en Toledo, . . ." In his note Ochoa asserts that obviously *Fray Miguel* is intended in lieu of *Fray Migir* and that *Fray Miguel*, whose identity is unknown, has no other composition in the

¹ P. J. Pidal, *Cancionero de Baena*, Madrid, 1851.

² *Nuova Enciclopedia Italiana*, Turin, 1882, under *messere*.

³ Pidal, *op. cit.*, No. 250.

⁴ "Feriame en la faz e en la calua."

Cancionero. In my opinion, some scribe—not necessarily the one who ultimately copied the poem in the *Cancionero*—may easily have confused *c* and *g* and written *Migir* for *Miçer*, all the more so since a scribe could hardly be expected to be familiar with this adaptation from a foreign tongue. The first poem in which we find *Miçer* is No. 226.

In the poem (No. 226) celebrating the birth (March 1405) of Prince John it will be observed that Imperial is represented as a 'former resident' of Seville ("morador que fue de Sevilla"). Therefore, the fact that the Fray Migir who wrote the later poem (No. 38) dealing with the death (December 25, 1406⁵) of Henry III was a resident of Segovia presents no obstacle in our supposition that Fray Migir and Imperial may have been one and the same person. In this case we are assuming, of course, that the heading to No. 226 is not a special one given by the definitive copyist of the *Cancionero de Baena*, but rather the heading which he found on the sheet from which he copied.

The Order of St. Jerome, to which Fray Migir belonged, was founded in Italy in 1373 and in the following year some of its members went to Spain, where they soon established monasteries in numerous localities.⁶ As may be seen, the time of the founding of this order and its activities fit well into the life of Imperial. In the various writings⁷ which have been available to me for consultation in regard to the early history of the Hieronymite Order, I fail to find any mention of Imperial; but this is not surprising, since only a few of its early members are mentioned.

As respects the poem attributed to Fray Migir, it may be said that its style is highly erudite and such as might be expected of Imperial; it has the *ubi sunt?* theme; moreover, it makes mention of many ancient and mediaeval notables, offering in this regard a striking similarity to other poems, especially Nos. 231 and 249, ascribed to Imperial.

ARCHER WOODFORD

Loyola University, Chicago

⁵ The first day of the year 1407, in accordance with the reckoning of that time; cf. Ochoa's note to No. 35 in Pidal, *op. cit.*, p. 647.

⁶ *Catholic Encyclopedia of America*, under *Hieronymites*; and Espasa, under *Jerónimo*.

⁷ José de Sigüenza, *Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo*, Madrid, 1907 (in *NBAE*, Vols. 8 and 12); Hélyot, *Histoire des Ordres religieux*, Paris, 1792.

ZU LESSINGS FAUST

Bei unsrer beklagenswert fragmentarischen Kenntniss von Lessings Faustdrama hat man den beiden ausführlichsten zeitgenössischen Berichten über diesen Dichtungsplan, von Blankenburg und von Engel, schon immer eine besondere Wichtigkeit beigemessen. Mit Recht sind sie darum auch in die Lessingausgaben von Lachmann-Muncker (Bd. 3) und Petersen-Olshausen (T. 10) mit den Textbruchstücken aufgenommen worden. Diese Entwürfe und sämtliche, nicht sehr zahlreiche Nachrichten über die Entwicklung von Lessings Faustdichtung nebst einem Ueberblick über die damit zusammenhängenden Fragen hat dann Robert Petsch 1911 in einem handlichen Bändchen der *Germanischen Bibliothek* (Abt. II, Bd. 4) herausgegeben, das jetzt bei allen Erörterungen des Problems heranzuziehen ist.

Nach K. G. Lessing hatte Engel zu verschiedenen Malen, zuletzt wohl im Februar 1776, sich sehr ausführlich mit G. E. Lessing über dessen Faustplan unterhalten, und schliesslich auf "vielmaliges Bitten" alles, was er darüber wusste, dem Bruder geschrieben. Seine Niederschrift "der Anlage der ersten Szene und der letzten Hauptwendung derselben," deren Engel sich "im allgemeinen" zu erinnern behauptete, erfolgte entweder 1785, oder wahrscheinlicher im Jahre 1784, in das auch Blankenburgs ähnliches und zum Vergleich sehr wesentliches Schreiben fällt (14. Mai), und an das sie sich anschliesst. Bedenken über die Zuverlässigkeit seines Berichts hatte Engel selbst nahegelegt, sowohl durch den Hinweis darauf, dass sein Gedächtnis nur dunkle Erinnerungen aufbewahrt hätte, als auch durch das weit bedenklidere Eingeständnis, Lücken ausgefüllt und "die ganze Szene hieherzuwerfen" gewagt zu haben. Die von Petsch in seiner Einleitung in dieser Hinsicht gemachten Andeutungen kamen jedoch so wenig über Vermutungen hinaus, wie die einiger seiner Vorgänger oder Nachfolger (besonders Erich Schmidts und H. Meyer-Benfey's in dem Aufsatz "Lessings Faustpläne," *GRM*, 12, 1924, S. 78 ff.).

Nun hatte aber Engel bereits am 1. September 1782, also wenigstens zwei Jahre vorher, einem Besucher Einiges über Lessings Faustplan erzählt, und dieser Besucher, der junge einundzwanzig-

jährige Theologiestudent Friedrich Münter aus Dänemark, der spätere Bischof von Seeland, hatte alles, was er von Engel darüber gehört, sorgfältig und gewissenhaft in seinem Tagebuch aufgezeichnet. Dieser der Lessingforschung bisher entgangene Bericht ist 1937 in einer Auswahl aus Münters Tagebüchern zum ersten Mal gedruckt worden (Frederik Münter et mindeskrift II: Aus den Tagebüchern Friedrich Münters. Wander- und Lehrjahre eines dänischen Gelehrten. Hsg. von Øjvind Andreasen. Teil 1: 1772-85. Kopenhagen und Leipzig, 1937). Das Zeugnis Münters auf S. 44/45 lautet wie folgt:

. . . zu Prof[essor] Engel, ein mittlerer hagerer, schwarzer Mann. sehr viel Geist im Blick, viel freundschaftliches u. gesprächig . . . Wieland schätzt er. Schimpft auf die Schwärmereyen u. Possen der Freimaurer. von den Genies. Lessing habe gesagt. Genie u. Hundsvott mir gleich, beides erwidre ich mit einem Orfeige. Lessings Wahrheitsvoll[er] Charakter. er wartete auf Göthens Faust. um s[einen] Herauszugeben. von Göthe. er hat gesagt in Berlin sein keine Kraftleute. Engel sagte ein Unterofficier hätte ihn das besser gelehrt. Von Lessings Faust. wenig ist geschr[ieben]. das meiste lag in Lessings Kopf. er sagte mir den Plan—Scene eine verfallene Gothische Kirche—sieben verfallene Altäre drin—auf dem Hochaltar Satan, auf den andern 6 dienstbare Teufel tronend. Satan fragt. was Sie den Tag gethan haben. Sie fangen an. 1. pralt. er habe Gewitter Wolk[en] geleitet. auf das Haus eines armen frommen Manns geleitet, dass er mit Weib u. Kind sich nackt habe retten müssen. Satan schlecht gehandelt. Elend kettet noch mehr an Gott. 2 pralt. er habe mehr gethan. Orkan erregt. eine Flotte voll Kinder im Meer ersäuft—die sind dein—Satan! S[atana]. die wären doch mein gewesen—hätten noch mehr Sünden auf sich gehäuft—hätten noch mehr verführt. 5. er habe mehr gethan als alle andern. in der Gestalt eines lebenswürdigen Jünglings habe er ein Mädchen verführt! S[atana] recht! die Andern stiften Unheil in der Körperwelt! dieser aber verdirbt die Geisterwelt! Was hast Du 6ter gethan! 6. Nichts! S[atana] gar nichts! 6. nur gedacht! Was? 6. ein Gedanke, der mehr ist, als aller andern Werk! dort lebt ein Weiser Jüngling. im höchsten Glück ohne Leidenschaften. ganz contemplativ. den will ich verführen u. von Gott abwendig machen! aber schwer wirds halten! er hat keine Leidensch[aften]. S[atana]. hat er nicht Wissbegierde, fass ihn da—Plan dazu gemacht. abit. ein Engel tritt auf. der alles gehört hat. Vereitelt alles, dad[ur]ch dass er ein Gebild macht, das Faust vorstellt, u. das die Teufel betrügt. diess macht alle Streiche u. diess holen die Teufel. der wahre Faust sieht diess alles im Traum—als alles vorbey ist, erwacht er, u. dankt der Vorsehung herzlich, dass er der Gefahr entgangen sei.—Lessing war kein Feind des Christenthums—nur konnte er das positive in der Relig[ion] nicht leid[en]. Nathan ist das ganze Bild s[einer] Empfindung in dem Punkt . . .

Die knappe, stichwortartige Erzählung Münters gibt vor allem

denen recht, die angenommen hatten, dass nur wenig über die erhaltenen Entwürfe hinaus von Lessing wirklich ausgeführt worden war. Dann aber bietet sie besonders die Möglichkeit, besser zu erkennen, was als "ein gewisser weichlicher Schwulst der Darstellung" in dem bisher bekannten Bericht Engels "auf Rechnung des Nachdichters" zu setzen ist, weil es "den reiferen Produkten Lessings fremd" war. (Vgl. R[udolf] A[lexander] S[chröder], Nachwort zum Neudruck des Faustfragments, Lessings, gest. v. d. Bremer Bibliophilen 1930, S. 30 f.). Wenn also auch die einzelnen Motive in beiden auf Engel zurückgehenden Versionen im wesentlichen dieselben geblieben sind, so verdienen doch einige äusserliche Verschiedenheiten ausdrücklich hervorgehoben zu werden.

Dass zunächst die Szenerie in dem von Münter festgehaltenen Bericht eine "verfallene" und nicht eine "zerstörte" gothische Kirche wie in Engels Niederschrift von 1784 zeigt, würde vielleicht ein in dem Originalentwurf der Berliner Handschrift vorgesehenes Läuten nicht ganz ausschliessen, und die Annahme einer späteren Aenderung von Lessings Hand unnötig machen. Dann scheint die bei Münter abweichende Bezifferung einzelner Teufel angemessener zu sein. Ohne Zweifel konnte sich Engel beidesmal nur noch an die Antworten von vier Teufeln erinnern, aber es ist viel sinngemässer, dass die im Bericht von 1784 dem vierten Teufel zugeschriebene Antwort, als die für die weitere Entwicklung des Dramas entscheidende, von dem letzten, dem sechsten Teufel gegeben wird. Ferner ist bemerkenswert, dass es sich bei der Untat des zweiten Teufels nicht um die Vernichtung einer Flotte mit "Wucherern" handelt, was etwas seltsam ist, und keinen rechten Sinn gibt, sondern 1782 um "eine Flotte voll Kinder." Schliesslich gehört die 1784 dem vierten Teufel zur Last fallende "Verführung" in ihrer Beschreibung ganz eindeutig zu dem "weichlichen Schwulst" aus Engels Feder, sodass jetzt die 1782 dem fünften Teufel zugeschriebene, mehr zu Lessings Stil passende Verführung an ihre Stelle treten kann. Alles in allem ist die Ueberlieferung bei Münter demnach freier von den Dichter "ergänzenden" Zusätzen des Nachdichters, zu denen freilich auch das manchen Auslegern als echt lessingisch erscheinende und sie besonders begeisternde: "Ihr sollt nicht siegen" gehören wird.

Weitaus das Bedeutungsvollste des Zeugnisses von 1782 bleibt

jedoch, dass auch nach ihm Lessings Faust den Pakt mit dem Teufel nicht in Wirklichkeit, sondern nur in einem Traum erlebt, den ihm der Himmel warnend geschenkt. Während er schläft, werden die Teufel durch ein Faust darstellendes "Gebilde" oder, wie es in dem Bericht von 1784 und bei Blankenburg heisst, ein "Phantom," zum Besten gehalten, und es ist dies von einem den teuflischen Plan überhörenden Engel geschaffene Gebilde, das sündigt und zuletzt in die Hölle fährt. Faust hat sein Leben als Traum mitangesehen und kann beim Erwachen der Vorsehung für diese Bewahrung danken, die nichts von einem Mysterium an sich hat. Die Wissbegierde Fausts war—ganz im Sinn der Aufklärung—nichts, wofür er büssen müsste, wenn sie ihn auch manchmal irren liess, und seine "Rettung" ist weder Gott noch dem eignen, strebenden Bemühen zuzuschreiben, sondern einem himmlischen—Theatertrick oder Täuscherspielerkniff. Denn auch der hier mitgeteilte, bisher noch unbekannte Bericht von 1782 bestätigt, dass die Phantoms-idee die wesentlichste der von Lessing geplanten und nur sehr fragmentarisch ausgeführten Faustdichtung für die Lösung des dramatischen Konfliktes war.

Friedrich Münters Tagebucheintrag über seinen Besuch bei Johann Jakob Engel in Berlin im Herbst 1782 und über dessen Erinnerungen an Lessings Faustplan stellt eine wertvolle Ergänzung des von Robert Petsch gesammelten, nun schon über vierzig Jahre der Forschung zur Verfügung stehenden Materials dar. In einem von mir vor kurzem erstmals veröffentlichten Brief von Christian Friedrich Voss vom 15. 12. 1770 (*Lessing*, Bern, 1951, S. 22) fragt dieser Lessing nach dem "jungen, unbesonnenen Doctor Faust," wodurch ausser den bei Petsch wiedergegebenen Briefzeugnissen ein weiteres hinzugefügt werden kann, dass Lessing in diesen Jahren mit seinen Freunden über seinen *Faust* sprach.

HEINRICH SCHNEIDER

Harvard University

RILKE'S SONETTE AN ORPHEUS AND
MAX DAUTHENDEY

The traces of French influence on the *Sonette an Orpheus* have often been discussed. Rilke translated Paul Valéry's work before and after the creation of the sonnets. Madame Baladine Klossowska told me in Paris that he admired Valéry more than he did Rodin. There is much of Valéry in these poems.

We cannot fathom what went on in Rilke's mind during the few days of creative surge which gave us the sonnets. But I can show that the perusal of a likely German source, just one year before the writing of the *Sonette*, left a deep imprint on the poet's imagination. In a letter of February 20, 1921, he wrote to Madame Baladine Klossowska as follows:

Chérie, lisez, je vous prie (im *Litterarischen Echo*) la lettre de Dauthenday —pas tant pour vous montrer son état d'âme, difficile à comprendre pour nous, mais infiniment tragique (pensez: dans ce Paradis d'amour, où tout collaborait à lui faire oublier cette Europe néfaste, il s'est consumé de nostalgie pour son pays tombé en enfer! . . .) pas tant à cause de cela, mais pour que vous y lisiez la description des danses javanaises, surtout de celle du roi avec les trois favorites. . . . Comme c'est beau! Pourquoi, mon Dieu, passe-t-on sa vie dans des mœurs qui vous entourent comme un déguisement étroit et qui vous empêchent de réaliser l'âme invisible, cette danseuse parmi les astres!¹

The dancer and the stars in that last sentence remind one already of the orphic poems.

O komm und geh. Du, fast noch Kind, ergänze
für einen Augenblick die Tanzfigur
zum reinen Sternbild eines jener Tänze,
darin wir die dumpf ordnende Natur
vergänglich übertreffen. . . . (II, 28)

Das literarische Echo, of February 15, 1921, contains an article by Walther Fischer (Würzburg): 'Max Dauthendey's letzte Grüße an die Heimat.' There is in it a long letter of Dauthendey to Gertraud Rostovsky in Würzburg. The date is September 7, 1915, Garoet (Java). The description of the dance mentioned in Rilke's letter is as follows:

¹ *Lettres françaises à Merline, 1919-1922* (Paris, 1950), p. 84.

Und nun sah ich etwas Seltenes. Ich sah den Sultan tanzen. Allein in der Mitte des Saales ging er im Tanzschritt, von allen am Hofe bewundert. Die Musik spielte älteste javanische Tanzmusik. Und drei Berufstänzerinnen, mit grünen oder himbeerroten Seidentüchern und goldenen Miedern angetan, tanzten mit nacktem Oberkörper um den tanzenden Sultan. Es war als ob ein Hahn mit drei Hennen oder ein Täufer mit drei Tauben tanzt. Aber es war eigentlich wunderbarer.—Der Sultan tanzte wie die Tänzerinnen barfuß. Er machte zuerst die Bewegungen eines Schlittschuhläufers, der Figuren auf dem Eis läuft und dabei die Arme bewegt, das Gleichgewicht suchend. Und die Arme werden Flügel und der Tänzer und die Tänzerinnen werden zuletzt wie Blumen, stillstehend und wiegen sich wie Blumen im Nachtwind viertelstundenlang auf gleicher Stelle und lassen die Finger und Handflächen statt der Füße tanzen und die Arme in den Gelenken wie die Blumen ihre Blüten und Blattzweige in der Luft sanft rhythmisch bewegen, wenn die Luft sie anatemt. Es ist aber auch als ob die Musik diese stillstehenden Tänzer anatemt und sie davon nur die Füße kaum merklich ein wenig drehen. Hauptsächlich tanzen aber die wundervollen Hände, diese schönsten Hände und Finger der Welt, die sicher Lichtstrahlen aus den schlanken Fingerspitzen ausstrahlen können, die wir mit unseren groben Augen nur nicht sehen können.

The description of this flower dance may have been an influence on the dancer's sonnets of Rilke's work. This applies to sonnet 1, 15, (Tanzt die Orange) where memories of Valéry's *l'Ame et la Danse* and André Gide's *Nourritures Terrestres* (La ronde de la grenade) have been recognized.

1, 25 describes the onset of the strange malady of Wera Ouckama Knoop to whose memory the sonnets are dedicated. But some lines seem to have a touch of the Dauthendey passage:

wie eine Blume, von der ich den Namen nicht weiss,
.....

Tänzerin erst, die plötzlich den Körper voll Zögern,
anhielt, als göss man ihr Jungsein in Erz; . . .

In 11, 18 the girl dances a tree:

Und der Wirbel am Schluss, dieser Baum aus Bewegung,
...

Blühte nicht, dasz ihn dein Schwingen von vorhin
umschwärme,
plötzlich sein Wipfel von Stille? . . .

...

Aber er trug auch, er trug, dein Baum der Extase.
Sind sie nicht seine ruhigen Früchte: . . .

Passages from Valéry and Mallarmé (Divagations) have been adduced as possible influences on this poem. The name of Dauthendey may safely be added.

The same theme is found in II, 28:

Du warst noch die von damals her Bewegte
und leicht befremdet, wenn ein Baum sich lang
besann, mit dir nach dem Gehör zu gehn.

The common feature of the Dauthendey passage and the poems quoted above is the representation of plant life through the medium of the dance.

There is a remarkable parallel between the last sentence of the Dauthendey quotation and II, 7, where the cut flowers come again to life in the water when placed

. . . zwischen die strömenden Pole
fühlender Finger, die wohlzutun
mehr noch vermögen, als ihr ahntet, . . .

In both cases we have a radiation from the fingertips of young girls. But the resemblance goes even further. Compare *die wohlzutun mehr noch vermögen als ihr ahntet* with *die wir mit unseren groben Augen nur nicht sehen können*.

CHARLES A. BENTLEY

Toronto

SEVERAL ALLUSIONS IN BRANT'S *NARRENSCHIFF*

Friedrich Zarncke and Edwin Zeydel left unexplained the following allusions in Brant's *Narrenschiff*.

1. Pyramides die kosten vil
Und Labyrinthus by dem Nyl,
Doch ist es als nun langst do hyn,
Keyn buw mag lang uff erd hye syn, (xv, 31-34).

Actually, the "labyrinth by the Nile" was mentioned by five classical authors—Pomponius Mela I, 56; Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis Historia*, xxxvi, 84 ff.; Herodotus II, 148; Strabo 17, I, 37; and Diodorus Siculus I, 66. All these works had been printed, and the Greek texts translated into Latin, in Italy by 1474, so

that almost any one of them could have been used by Brant. But Pliny is most likely the source not only because of Brant's use of Pliny elsewhere but also because of Pliny's description of the pyramids—

Dicantur obiter et pyramides in eadem Aegypto, regum pecuniae otiosa ac stulta ostentatio—(xxxvi, 75).

His reference to the labyrinth also mentions its age but in a sense quite different from Brant's—

portentosissimum humani impendii opus—(labyrinthus) Aegyptius, quod miror equidem, introitu lapidis e Paro columnique, reliqua e syenite molibus compositis, quas dissolvere ne saecula quidem possint, adjuvantibus Heraeopolitis, quod opus invisum mire spectavere. (xxxvi, 84 f.)

2. Durch wyn der töuffer köppfet wart, (xvi, 24)

The anonymous author of the *Gesta Romanorum*¹ refers to Herod's drunkenness in chapter 179, entitled "De gula et ebrietate," similar to Brant's heading "von fullen und prassen"—

Herodes Antipas sanctum Johannem non decollasset, si crapule et ebrietatis convivium defuisset.

This version might very well have been Brant's source.

3. Mancher kan ratten ander lüt
Der jm doch selb kan raten nüt
Als Gentilis und Mesue
Der yeder starb am selben we
Des er meynt helfen yederman. (xxi, 19-23)

Gentile Gentili da Foligno was a noted Italian doctor of the fourteenth century (died 1348).² It is generally accepted that he died of the plague, since direct references are to be found in introductions to early editions of his works. John Mesue was a Christian Arabian doctor of the ninth century (died 857).³ His manner of death does not seem to have been recorded by contemporaries, but he also wrote on fevers and plague. Furthermore, Gentile wrote a commentary on Mesue's work, so that the analogy might have led to the confusion that both men died of the plague.

¹ ed. H. Oesterley. Berlin, 1872, p. 584.

² Sarton, George, *Introduction to the History of Science*, Baltimore, 1947, III, 848-852.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 574.

4. Oder als dett Pythagoras
Der usz Memphis geboren was, (LXVI, 137-8)

Although no mention of his birth at Memphis has been found, Porphyrius, *De Vita Pythagorae*, 7 and Iamblichus, *De Vita Pythagorae*, 13 claim that he studied for some years at Memphis, so that either Brant or some earlier writer may have taken Memphis as Pythagoras' native town.

CRAIG B. FISHER

Alameda, California

SAMUEL JOHNSON IN BRUNSWICK

It has not been previously remarked that there is a German translation of Johnson's political tract, *Taxation No Tyranny*. A copy has been located in the Harvard College Library, and it is apparently the work of Julius August Remer, who also edited the volumes in which it appears. The translation is in the second volume of a three-volume set, the general title of which is *Amerikanisches Archiv, herausgegeben von Julius August Remer, Professor der Geschichte. Erster [—Dritter] Band.* (Braunschweig, im Verlag der Fürstl. Waisenhaus-Buchhandlung, 1777.)

The first volume of the set contains a translation of the famous pamphlet, *Observations on Civil Liberty and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*, by Richard Price (the German title is *Anmerkungen über die Natur der Bürgerlichen Freyheit . . .*). Also included in the first volume are a translation of Burke's *Speech on Reconciliation*, the *Briefe des Generals Lee, und des Generals Burgoyne, bey Gelegenheit der Ankunft des Letztern in Boston*, and *Anhang zu Doctor Price's Schrift*. With the exception of a portion of Burke's speech, the first volume was translated by Matthaeus Theodor Christoph Mittelstedt (1712-1777), who died before the volume was published.

Pages 1-56 of volume two contain the translation of *Taxation No Tyranny*, under the title *Schatzung keine Tyranney./ Eine Antwort/ auf/ die Entschlüsse und Addressen/ des/ Amerikanischen Congresses./ [short rule]/ Nach der vierten Ausgaben aus dem Englischen/ übersetzt.*

Translations of two other tracts appear in volume two: the first of these is Josiah Tucker's *An Humble Address and Earnest Appeal . . .* (1775), under the German title *Eine demüthige Vorstellung und ernstliche Appellation. . . .* The third tract is Arthur Lee's *An Appeal to the Justice and Interests of the People of Great Britain* (1774), with the German title *Berufung auf die Gerechtigkeit und den Vortheil des Grossbrittannischen Nation*, followed by Lee's *Zweite Berufung*, originally published in English in 1775.

Volume three contains a translation of James Lind's *Remarks on the Principal Acts of the Thirteenth Parliament . . .* (1775), under the title *Anmerkungen über die vornehmsten Acten des dreyzehnten Parlements*.

Four principal editions of *Taxation No Tyranny* appeared in 1775, and the work was answered by many pamphleteers. It is interesting to find still another reverberation of the great quarrel—this time as far away as Brunswick.

The sympathies of the court of Brunswick were pro-British. The reigning duke, Karl I, had aligned the duchy with Prussia and England during the Seven Years' War; the campaigns had greatly impoverished the country, and the Duke sought to repair his finances by renting mercenary troops to England for use against the American rebels. The heir to the throne, Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand, had married Princess Augusta of England (the eldest sister of George III) in 1764; Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand was liberal in his political outlook, and it is indicative of this attitude that Remer was able to reveal his American sympathies as clearly as he did in *Amerikanisches Archiv*. With many Brunswickers in British service in America, interest in the war was probably quite keen throughout the duchy.

In the editor's introductory remarks (II, [iv-v]) is the following passage which concerns Johnson's tract:

Johnsons Schatzung keine Tyranny, und Tukes [i.e. Tucker's] Vorschlag, die Colonien ganz aufzuheben, sind von den vorher angezeigten geblieben. Dass ich die erste Schrift an die Spitze der Vertheidigungen des Ministerii gestellt, schien mir, ihr grosser Ruf zu fordern. Der Leser mag in dessen selbst urtheilen, ob dieselbe das Rednerische und die Schönheiten des Johnsonschen Styls abgerechnet, das leiste, was die critischen englischen Blätter, die der Hofparthey zugethan sind, davon rühmten, und ob die Gründe der Vertheidiger der Sache der Amerikaner durch sie so völlig widerlegt sind, als die Ministerialparthey behauptete.

From this it would appear that Remer was anti-British in his opinions on the American question, although he purports to allow the reader to make up his own mind about the matter. The reference to the rhetorical and stylistic beauties of Johnson's prose is an interesting addition to what is already known of Johnson's reputation in Europe during his own lifetime.

The translation itself is a straightforward attempt. It fails completely to capture the sonority of Johnson's periods, but remains content to give the substance of his sentences and arguments. Although not overly fond of Johnson's style, Remer was acutely conscious of the English champion's formidable dialectic skill.

Three footnotes give clues to Remer's opinion of Johnsonian prose, and also throw light on his attitude towards the British-American quarrel. On page three of volume two is the annotation to the word "demonstrator" (translated as "Demonstrirer"):

Ich trage kein Bedenken, diese fremden Wörter bezubehalten, da es mit zum Eigenthümlichen des Johnsonschen etwas pretiösen Styls gehört, dass er sich derselben sehr häufig bedient.

On page 17 is the note: "*Ramifications*, ein Wort, das neu gemacht zu seyn scheint." Yet Johnson himself had used this word twenty years before in the Preface to the *Dictionary*, and also gave it an entry in that compilation. Bailey's *Dictionary* recorded a specialized usage of the word in 1731; the first use of the term in English was in 1677, according to the *N.E.D.*

A note on page 50 reads:

The argument of the irregular troops in controversy, vermuthlich diejenigen Schriftsteller, die neben zu, und ohne sich auf die Untersuchung der ganzen Streitigkeit einzulassen, etwas zum Besten der Amerikaner gesagt haben.

This slightly changes the import of the original, for Johnson wrote: "The argument of the irregular troops of controversy . . ." (cf. *Political Tracts* . . ., London, 1776, p. 250), but the difference is very slight.

Remer had a distinguished career. He was born in Brunswick in 1736, and there died in 1803. In 1774 he was appointed assistant professor of history, and director of intelligence affairs and newspapers in Brunswick. Thus he was in a position to study Anglo-American affairs from close at hand, for he no doubt received the

major British journals and topical pamphlets. In 1779 he was made full professor of history, a post which he afterwards held at Helmstedt. He published widely and frequently, and was evidently deeply interested in American affairs, for in addition to the *Archiv*, he wrote the *Geschichte des Krieges zwischen Grossbritannien und den vereinigten bourbonischen Mächten und Nordamerikanischen Kolonien* (1ster Band, der das Jahr 1778 enthält; Leipzig, 1780). He also edited Karl Stedman's *Geschichte des amerikanischen Kriegs* (Berlin, 1794-96, 2v.).

ROBERT F. METZDORF

Yale University

THE ROSEMARY THEME IN *ROMEO AND JULIET*

In *Romeo and Juliet* there is surprisingly little flower imagery; what little there is, is for the most part conventional.¹ Three passages, however, seem to me to have greater significance: Friar Laurence's soliloquy at the beginning of II. 3; the rosemary-Romeo passage at II. 4. 218-24; and the funeral-flowers passage in IV. 5. It is the purpose of this note to point out the relationship between these passages, for they are, within the structure of the play, organically related: in the first there is a generalized statement that is given specific application in the second and third. Considered together, they supply a motif that contributes to the total meaning of the play.

Friar Laurence is introduced at the beginning of II. 3. He has

¹ Lady Capulet and the Nurse refer to Paris as "a flower" (I. 3. 77-8); the Nurse says that Romeo "is not the flower of courtesy" (II. 5. 44); Mercutio and Romeo pun on "pink" (II. 4. 61-4). The metaphorical equation of youth and bud appears three times (I. 1. 155-9; I. 2. 26-30; II. 2. 121-2). Juliet mentions the rose but once (II. 2. 43-4); and only once is she equated with the rose (IV. 1. 99). Two other purely conventional uses of flowers appear at III. 2. 73 and V. 3. 9. In IV. 5, however, both parents employ striking flower images in expressing their grief. Lady Capulet (28-9) says: "Death lies on her like an untimely frost / Upon the sweetest flower of all the field." Capulet (35-6) says: "See there she lies, / Flower as she was, deflowered by him [Death]." These are the only brilliant flower images in the play. It is significant, I think, that they are employed by Juliet's parents and are therefore "outside" the love story.

come into the fields to gather "balefull weeds and precious-juiced flowers." This contrast suggests to him the paradox of Earth being both "tomb" and "womb" for her child, Nature. The paradox, in turn, suggests the concept that nothing is created without purpose: "None but for some, and yet all different," and two lines later, "For naught so vile that on the earth doth live / But to the earth some special good doth give." The Friar then comments that virtue misapplied turns into vice, and vice is sometimes "by action dignified." At this point (line 23) the Friar selects a flower and comments on the ambiguous nature of the plant:² "Within the infant rind of this small flower / Poison hath residence, and medicine power." The odor "cheers" but a taste "slays." The nature of this flower seems analogous to the nature of man, and the Friar concludes with a generalized statement that, like so many other forebodings in the text, points to the final catastrophe:

Two such opposed kinds encamp them still
In man as well as herbs—grace and rude will;
And where the worser is predominant,
Full soon the canker death eats up that plant.

Coleridge remarked that this scene "is no digression, but immediately necessary to the carrying on of the plot."³ Both Steevens and Farmer called attention to the fact that the scene prepares us for the part the Friar is afterwards to sustain.⁴ This the Friar's speech certainly does; but the passage has further implications. The central idea of the Friar's soliloquy is the paradox of good and evil as illustrated by the dual nature of the flower.

The only flower that is mentioned more than twice in the play is rosemary, and rosemary is itself a paradoxical plant. In the elaborate flower symbolism of the time, it signified remembrance and was customarily employed at both weddings and funerals.⁵

² T. P. Harrison ("Hang up Philosophy," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, XXII, 203-9) would make a specific identification, pointing out that the Friar's plant has certain qualities attributed to aconite. With this identification I cannot agree. The Friar's flower, the name carefully unspecified, is a rosemary-like, *i. e.* ambiguous, plant for which no exact counterpart can be expected in nature.

³ *Literary Remains*, II, 155.

⁴ *Variorum*, p. 111.

⁵ Dyce was apparently the first to note in connection with this passage

Because of its dual usage, rosemary has both favorable and unfavorable connotations: it suggests both love and death.

Now at II. 4. 216-22, rosemary and Romeo are expressly linked. The Nurse says "Doth not rosemary and Romeo begin both with a letter?" The linkage is underscored a few lines later when she adds that Juliet "hath the prettiest sententious of it, of you and rosemary, that it would do you good to hear it."

that rosemary was used at both weddings and funerals (*Variorum*, p. 140). This dual use is illustrated in Herrick's little poem *The Rosemarie Branch* (Moorman, p. 232):

Grow for two ends, it matters not at all,
Be't for my *Bridall*, or my *Buriall*.

And Parkinson (*Paradisi in Sole Paradisus Terrestris*, London, 1629, p. 76) writes: "Rosemary is an hearbe of as great use with us in these dayes, as any other whatsoever, not only for Physicall, but civill purposes: the civil uses as all know, are at Weddings, Funerals, &." Professor Allan Gilbert has kindly called my attention to the following:

Rosmarino, gesmini, e tutti li fiori senza mai far frutti, come rose, gigli, significheno amor gettato via; da cui mai frutti non si possono aspettare se non vane dimostrazioni: come ancho foglia di cipresso. (Morato, *Del Significato de Colori e de Massolli*, Vinegia, 1545, Sig. D6).

I have been unable to find an English equivalent for this interesting (and particularly appropriate) signification of rosemary.

Romeo and Juliet is not the only Elizabethan play to make use of rosemary. In Rowley's *The Noble Soldier* (printed in 1634 but written c. 1600) much is made of the dual associations of the flower. Rosemary is adopted as the badge of the revenging faction. Baltazar remarks, "Men show like coarses, for I meet few but are stuck with Rosemary: every one ask'd mee who was married to day, and I told 'em Adultery and Repentence, and that shame and a Hangman followed 'em to Church." (Sigs. G4, G4^v). Medina then says,

But execution must close up the Scaene,
And for that cause these sprigs are worne by all,
Badges of Marriage, now of Funerall,
For death this day turnes Courtier.

(Sig. G4^v)

The symbolic use of rosemary increases the effectiveness of the final scene. The revengers appropriately decked with rosemary are all present at the bridal banquet. But instead of honoring the bride-to-be, the flowers betoken the death of the king. The irony in this situation adds somewhat to the power of the dénouement of this stock revenge tragedy.

In *Hamlet* (v. 1. 267-68) rosemary clearly lies behind the Queen's lines:

I thought thy bride-bed to have deck'd, sweet maid,
And not have strew'd thy grave.

In iv. 5 rosemary is again introduced, and again in terms of paradox. The potion has taken effect, and Juliet is thought to be dead. Capulet laments the loss with a series of paradoxes that ends:

Our solemn hymns to sullen dirges change;
Our bridal flowers serve for a buried corse;
And all things change them to the contrary.

The rosemary theme is now complete. The generalized paradox of good and evil as illustrated by the ambiguous nature of the Friar's flower has been followed by the specific and underscored linking of Romeo and rosemary; and finally, Juliet's bridal flowers (rosemary) become funeral wreaths.

The rosemary theme in *Romeo and Juliet* is a minor one. Although the terms of its imagery are not drawn from the same category as the primary imagery of the play, there is a relationship between the two. In the primary metaphor, the love of Romeo and Juliet is equated with fire.⁶ Like rosemary, fire is an ambiguous symbol. Only ambiguous symbols could serve Shakespeare to express the situation of those radiant young lovers who "in their triumph die, like fire and powder / Which as they kiss consume." The rosemary theme, ambiguous in its nature, parallels the primary imagery of the play and thereby supplies, in essence, a miniature statement of the theme of the drama.

PHILIP WILLIAMS

Duke University

WORDSWORTH'S ANNOTATIONS IN DANIEL'S POETICAL WORKS

Wordsworth's first acquaintance with the poetry of Samuel Daniel was through Robert Anderson's *British Poets*.¹ Later he acquired a copy of the anonymous two-volume 1718 edition, *The Poetical Works of Mr. Samuel Daniel*. These volumes, now in the Dove Cottage collection of the museum at Grasmere, contain a few manuscript notes and other markings in Wordsworth's hand.²

⁶ See Caroline Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery*, pp. 18, 64-66; for a more detailed analysis, Moody Prior, *The Language of Tragedy*, pp. 61-73.

¹ See his note to "Yarrow Revisited," *Poetical Works*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1940-1949), II, 490.

² This edition of Daniel is first mentioned in a manuscript catalogue of

In general, the notes and markings in these volumes indicate that he shared the attitude of Lamb and Coleridge toward particular works of Daniel: small interest in *The Complaint of Rosamond*, admiration for parts of *The Civil Wars*, strong liking for the ethical strain in the *Epistles*, and enthusiasm for *Hymen's Triumph*.

The notes below, transcribed from the museum copy of Daniel by Miss Helen Darbishire, are said by her to be in pencil, in Wordsworth's "indubitable hand, but so rubbed and faint as to be nearly illegible."³ They were probably not written very early, perhaps some time after 1815, in the opinion of the transcriber, who also attributes the other markings in pencil to Wordsworth.

[vol. 1 on the blank page (36) before *The Complaint of Rosamond*]

This poem is prolix & dull throughout, and to me in many places disgusting. It contains few touches of passion, nor is it easy to find out how it ever could be popular, as we are told it was. The parson-like old woman's morality & the story []⁴ of Rosamond I must think have been its chief recommendation.

[vol. 1 on the blank page (86) before *Hymen's Triumph*]

This poem of *Hymen's Triumph* is far superior to the *Queen's Arcadia*. The story, it is true, is grossly improbable, but the piece⁵ has sufficient unity

Wordsworth's library at Rydal Mount, compiled in 1829, now in Houghton Library of Harvard University. In a fly-leaf of one of the volumes is a note written by William Wordsworth, the poet's grandson, dated March, 1858, testifying to Wordsworth's fondness for Daniel. The copy next passed into the hands of Henry Charles Beeching, noted poet and editor of Shakespeare. Beeching mentions the Daniel and quotes from it a manuscript note by Wordsworth in his *Selection from the Poetry of Samuel Daniel and Michael Drayton* (London, 1899), pp. xvii-xviii. Before his death in 1919 Beeching returned the volumes once more to the Wordsworth collection. For identifying the Beeching gift-copy at Grasmere as the copy originally in Wordsworth's possession and for assistance in other details of this investigation I am indebted to my friend William G. Lane of Duke University.

³ I owe a considerable debt to Miss Darbishire, who not only made and verified the transcriptions but also obtained permission of the other Dove Cottage trustees for me to publish these notes.

⁴ The word presumably substituted for "story" is illegible.

⁵ At this point Wordsworth inserts the afterthought "although sadly injured the underplot of Montanus," but it is either rubbed out or has

of interest, and is everywhere scattered over with beautiful touches of passion and description written with true simplicity. The language is throughout admirable, though not altogether without conceits, and the sentiments, where they are pleasing themselves, are sometimes unsuited to the characters. The underplot of Montanus injures the piece sadly.

[vol. 1, page 150, at the head of *The Queen's Arcadia*]

natural language but a dull and uninteresting performance.

In volume II three stanzas in Book II of the *Civil Wars* are marked along the margins in pencil. This portion of the poem narrates the advice of Montague to King Richard and the subsequent ambush laid for the king's capture. These stanzas, of which I quote only the opening lines, present a wild natural scenery—very rare in Daniel—that doubtless attracted Wordsworth strongly.

Here have you craggy Rocks to take your Part,
That never will betray their Faith to you;
These trusty Mountains here will never start,
But stand t' upbraid their Shame that are untrue. (II, 29) ⁶

A Place there is, where proudly rais'd there stands
A huge aspiring Rock, neighb'ring the Skies. (II, 48)

And here, in hidden Cliffs concealed lay
A Troop of armed Men. (II, 49)

On page 352 of this volume Wordsworth has marked with a cross (+) the title *To the Lady Margaret, Countess of Cumberland*, one of his favorite poems.⁷ Further along in the poem, on page 354, a similar mark is placed against the line "Knowing the Heart of Man is set to be." This line and the remainder of the stanza from Daniel (II, 92-99) Wordsworth incorporated without change in Book IV, lines 324-331 of *The Excursion*.⁸

become nearly illegible. At any rate, the concluding sentence proves that he took the trouble to revise his note. Most of this annotation was transcribed by Beeching. See note 2 above.

⁶ This presentation of a beneficent and protecting nature is close to Wordsworth's own outlook. One is reminded of a passage in *Tintern Abbey*:

"Knowing that Nature never did betray
The heart that loved her." (II, 122-123)

⁷ See his warm praise of this verse epistle in a letter to Lady Beaumont, dated November 20, 1811, in *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt (Oxford, 1937), II, 477.

⁸ Wordsworth acknowledges the borrowing in a note to *The Excursion*

Finally in volume II the following sonnets are marked with a cross.⁹

- IV These plaintive Verse, the Posts of my Desire
- IX If this be Love to draw a weary Breath
- XIX Restore thy Tresses to the Golden Oar
- XX What it is breathe and live without Life
- XXIX Still in the Trace of one perplexed Thought
- XXXVI Look, Delia, how w'esteem the half-blown Rose
- XLVIII I must not grieve my Love, whose Eyes would read
- XLI (really LI) Care-charmer Sleep, Son of the sable Night
- LII Let others sing of *Knights* and *Palladines*
- LVII Lo here the Impost of a Faith entire.

After the sonnets, on page 419, the last poem marked is "A Pastoral," beginning with "O happy Golden Age."

CECIL C. SERONSY

State Teachers' College,
Bloomsburg, Pa.

THE MONK AND LE DIABLE AMOUREUX

Whether or not M. G. Lewis's Gothic romance *The Monk* is indebted to Jacques Cazotte's *Le Diable Amoureux* is a question of long standing. Cazotte's fantastic tale, of a Spanish soldier who dabbles in magic and is tempted by Beelzebub in the form of a beautiful woman, was first published in Paris in 1772. An anonymous English translation, *The Devil in Love*, appeared in London in 1793. Three years later *The Monk* was before the public, and the tradition of Lewis's indebtedness to Cazotte was initiated soon after—at least as early as August 1797, when the *Monthly Review* in a hostile notice of *The Monk* declared that "the form of temptation is borrowed from the *Devil in Love* of Cazotte. . . ." ¹ Though Lewis four years later explicitly stated ² that he had not read the French story before *The Monk* was published, the opinion

(*Poetical Works*, iv, 424-425), where he speaks in further praise of Daniel's poem.

⁹ In addition to the sonnet number, I give the first line of each sonnet, because of the differences in numbering found in the many editions.

¹ xxiii, 451.

² *Adelmorn, the outlaw*, London, 1801, p. [vii].

of the *Monthly Review* was repeated on all sides, and the majority of later writers on the subject of Lewis's sources have been, with varying degrees of conviction, of the same mind.

A comparison of the two stories does not, in this writer's opinion, yield sufficient evidence to refute Lewis's statement. The basic theme of diabolical temptation by means of a beautiful woman was already old and widespread before Cazotte wrote, and, with one exception, the scattered incidental similarities brought forward to support the theory of Lewis's debt seem negligible. Before Lewis's word can be accepted, however, this one exception must be disposed of.

Some years ago an investigator advanced an apparently strong case for the influence of the French work upon *The Monk* when he spoke of "certain passages that coincide almost word for word" and, without citing specific texts, offered as an example the following remarkable similarity: we read of Biondetta that her "dress discovered part of her bosom, and the moonbeams darting full upon it, enabled me to observe its dazzling whiteness," while in *The Monk* we find "The moonbeams darting full upon it [Matilda's breast] enabled the monk to observe its dazzling whiteness."³ This word for word correspondence, altogether too close for mere coincidence, appeared to discredit Lewis conclusively and has recently been revived as evidence of his debt to Cazotte.⁴

After comparing both *Le Diable Amoureux* and *The Devil in Love* with *The Monk*, however, one is forced to conclude that, aside from the quoted passage, the "passages that coincide almost word for word" simply do not exist. As for the quoted passage, one is momentarily puzzled to discover that it too is lacking. The French text reads, "sa chemise était une chemise de page, et au passage, la lumière de la lune ayant frappé sur sa cuisse, avait paru gagner au reflet."⁵ *The Devil in Love* translated this, "her only covering being a page's shirt, the brightness of the moon displayed to my view her polished limbs, and its rays appeared more brilliant from the reflection."⁶ But the difficulty is solved when we turn

³ Eino Railo, *The Haunted Castle*, London, 1927, pp. 260-1.

⁴ Mario Praz, *The Romantic Agony*, translated from the Italian by Angus Davidson, 2nd ed., 1951, pp. 192, 272 (Note 4).

⁵ J. Cazotte, *Le diable amoureux*, ed. A. J. Pons, Paris, 1878, p. 112.

⁶ *The Devil in Love*, translated from the French. London, 1793, p. 45.

to another book. *Le Diable Amoureux* was translated into English a second time as *Biondetta, or the enamoured spirit: a romance*. This anonymous work, which is independent of the 1793 translation, appeared in London in 1810, fourteen years after *The Monk*. Its evident purpose was, in part, at least, to satirize Lewis and publicize his supposed theft. The title page carries the information "Translated from *Le Diable Amoureux* of M. Cazotte; and dedicated (without permission) to M. G. Lewis, Esq.;" in a prefatory note the translator ironically calls attention to the resemblance between Matilda and Biondetta and reminds Lewis of his statement concerning *Le Diable Amoureux*. When *Biondetta* is examined for the passage in question, what has happened becomes immediately clear. The text reads, "her dress discovered part of her bosom, and the moon beams darting full upon it, enabled me to observe its dazzling whiteness."⁷ The anonymous translator lifted the passage from *The Monk* and published it as his translation from the French, presumably to strengthen the impression of Lewis's dishonesty. When, over a century later, the similarity was noted, its discoverer apparently examined only *Biondetta* and *The Monk*, and aware that a translation of *Le Diable Amoureux* had preceded *The Monk*, mistakenly assumed that *Biondetta* reproduced the text of the earlier translation. It is a satisfaction to expose the anonymous satirist's unsportsmanlike little trick and to observe that although it may still be debatable whether Lewis knew Cazotte's story before writing *The Monk*, the best evidence hitherto presented for the affirmative must now be abandoned.

LOUIS F. PECK

Pennsylvania State College

SMOLLETT'S "GOTHIC": AN ILLUSTRATION

The "Gothic" elements in *Ferdinand Count Fathom*¹ antedate *The Castle of Otranto* by more than ten years. The "Gothic," as it is defined by the romancers who followed Walpole, had no place in the realistic novel of the first half of the eighteenth century,

⁷ Page 54.

¹ Chapters 20, 21, 34, 62, 63.

nor in the picaresque before Smollett. As Smollett is not generally credited with inventing much, his genius lying in observation and appropriation, so in the case of the "Gothic" he was rather aligning old material with a new form than actually inventing. One of the "Gothic" scenes in *Fathom*, Renaldo's watch at the tomb of Monimia, indicates that Smollett found this old material in the theatre, not library drama but the living stage, and specifically in Congreve.

G. M. Kahl has demonstrated that Smollett was a regular and constant student of the stage all his life. *Fathom* shows its influence more than any other of Smollett's novels. It is full of Shakespearean quotations; definite parallels can be traced with Otway's *Orphan*; the choice of its principal character "from the purlieus of treachery and fraud" is in deliberate imitation of a Richard or a Maskwell;² and Congreve's *Mourning Bride* provided the direct inspiration for the scene at Monimia's tomb.

During the formative years of *Fathom*, *The Mourning Bride* received an important revival by Garrick, with Garrick himself in the role of Osmyn. Thirteen performances were given during the 1750-1 season, and two each during 1751-2 and 1752-3.³ It would have been exceptional if Smollett's interest in the theatre had not taken him to so important a revival by one from whom he expected much toward the production of his own plays.

The resemblances between Smollett's scenes of Chapter 62 and 63 and Congreve's Act II, Scene 2, are too close in incident and even imagery to have been accidental. Both concern the reuniting of lovers who believe the other dead. There are prostrations upon the tomb, invocations of the spirits of the beloved, appearances of the ghost-like forms which are in reality "not the shadow" but "the warm substance." Both scenes are set in "caves of death" where wind whistles through vaulted aisles. Congreve's ghost is "that tender lovely form of painted air so like Almeria"; Smollett's assumes "a medium of embodied air, in semblance of that lovely form." Both heroines are similarly overcome: to Congreve's, "It is too much!"; Smollett's, with a little more eighteenth-century decorum, finds a chair to sink down upon, but the words are the same, "Indeed, this is too much!"

² *Fathom*. Prefatory Address.

³ Emmett L. Avery, *Congreve's Plays on the Eighteenth Century Stage* (New York, 1951), pp. 81, 93-7.

The alignment of quotations is never so satisfactory as a complete reading of the scenes for spirit and content. It should also be noted that Smollett's scene is dramatic beyond what is generally characteristic of the author. The action is minutely delineated. Renaldo lays himself upon the cold ground, he mechanically raises himself upon one knee with his body advancing forwards, he gazes with a look through which his soul seems eager to escape, the apparition lifts her veil, thrice he essays to answer, his hair stands upright and a cold vapour seems to thrill through every nerve, he starts from the ground, he catches her in his arms. Even the dialogue is put to use for descriptive purposes, surely not the technique of the novelist: "I fould her in my arms! I press her glowing breast to mine! . . ." etc.

It is easy to believe that Smollett wrote the scene from recollections, either conscious or unconscious, of what must have been to him a very real experience in the theatre. As such, it not only illustrates an origin of the "Gothic," but also allows us a swift, passing glimpse of one phase of Smollett's genius in actual operation.

CATHERINE L. ALMIRALL

South Salem, N. Y.

THE ROMAN DE LA ROSE AND VAUQUELIN DE LA FRESNAIE

To the examples of medieval influence on French literature of the sixteenth century may be added those supplied by Vauquelin de la Fresnaie, who wrote in one of his *idillies*

Lors ie disois: ô malin Fauxsemblant,
Pourquoy vas tu ce Belacueil troublant?¹

This same author alludes elsewhere to the same *Roman*:

L'ay donc cueilli la Rose au rosier de bonheur, . . .²

The last lines of the *idillie* XXVIII also are inspired by our *Roman*:

¹ *Les diverses poésies de Jean Vauquelin, sieur de la Fresnaie*, ed. Julien Travers (Caen, 1870), II, 473. Cf. A. P. Lemerrier, *Etude . . . sur les poésies de J. Vauquelin de la Fresnaie* (Nancy, 1887), p. 75.

² *Les diverses poésies* . . . , II, 563, cf. p. 812.

Au moins tant qu'il aura memoire
Que sous leur ombre il eut la gloire

...

D'avoir . . .

Cueilli de la belle Angeline

La Rose dans son aiglantier.³

Let us add that Vauquelin seems to know the *Roman* better even than Marot and Ronsard, for he mentions two characters of this work, without mangling their names as do Marot and Ronsard⁴ when they speak of *Faux-Danger*, a character unknown to Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun.

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

ADDITIONS TO BENGESCO'S BIBLIOGRAPHIE

In his discussion of *l'Evangile du jour*, Bengesco¹ refers to the fact that the *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes*, in its second edition, describes the *Evangile* as consisting of 18 volumes although Beuchot and Bengesco himself had knowledge of only sixteen. I was able to locate the other two volumes at the Bibliothèque nationale. Their contents are as follows:

Vol. xvii

L'Evangile du jour. Tome dixseptième.

(subtitle) L'Evangile du jour contenant Prix de la justice et de l'humanité en 28 articles.

Londres (Amsterdam) 1780

Vol. xviii

L'Evangile du jour. Tome dixhuitième.

(subtitle) L'Evangile du jour contenant Le Nazaréen de Toland.

Londres (Amsterdam) 1780

(second subtitle) Le Nazaréen ou le Christianisme des Juifs, des Gentils et des Mahométans traduit de l'anglais de Jean Toland.

Then follows a preface and then another subtitle:

Lettres ou Dissertations L'une sur les Nazaréens, L'autre sur le christianisme tel qu'il se pratiquoit en Irlande dans les premiers siècles.

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

University of California at Los Angeles

³ *Les diverses poésies* . . . , II, 560, cf. p. 811.

⁴ Marcel Françon, "Ronsard et la poésie populaire," *MLN* (1950), 55-57.

¹ *Voltaire-Bibliographie de ses œuvres*, II, 404-405.

REVIEWS

GOETHE—*Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche.*

Herausgegeben von ERNST BEUTLER. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag.

Vols. 1, 5, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 23.

Volume 1, edited by Emil Staiger, contains all the poems of the *Ausgabe letzter Hand*, i.e. all those sanctioned and arranged by Goethe for the last edition of his works. Textually they are here reprinted in the form of the *Sophienausgabe*, but with important revisions to the effect that for the first time the reader will have before him the version such as the poet intended it had not the careless hand of the typesetter or the whim of metrical theorists (Schlegel, Voß) interfered with the will of the genius. A glance at "Alexis und Dora" will justify such a procedure of the editor, when instead of the metrically "correct" "Einer nur steht rückwärts traurig gewendet am Mast" and "Einzigem Augenblick, in welchem ich lebte" we now read the original "faulty lines" "Nur ein Trauriger steht rückwärts gewendet am Mast" and "Nur ein Augenblick wars, in dem ich lebte." Taken out of the context these changes may seem unimportant, but in the flow of the poem they make or mar the poetry. Another improvement over the A. l. H. is the addition of early versions if, esthetically, they have the right of coexistence with the last, as, for instance, in "König von Thule," "Willkommen und Abschied," "An den Mond."

Thirty-nine pages as an introduction to such a corpus lyricum are indeed a feat of concentration, but Staiger succeeds in tersely characterizing Goethe's successive lyrical epochs, his wealth of forms, his conquest of new expression and his ever renewed "Stirb und werde." The index gives as a welcome addition to titles and beginnings of poems, their dates of genesis.

Volume 5, "Faustdichtungen," edited by Ernst Beutler, presents the different versions, the *Paralipomena* in their new and practical arrangement by Hecker (Mainzer Ausgabe of 1937), all of Goethe's utterances concerning the drama, 80 pages of introduction, a chronological table, and 80 pages of Worterklärungen (The latter term is really a misnomer or an understatement, for the editor here gives in succinct form a whole commentary with historical source material, explanations, and corroborating quotations from G's own works, details which would have encumbered Beutler's essay).

In the very vividly written introduction Beutler incorporates into a *summa Faustologica* not only the safe results of over a hundred years of Faust investigation, but also his own numerous

previous articles. Only the Goethe scholar can fathom what digest every word of this essay required in study, rejection, decision and wording. The account of the saga and Faust theme before G. seems especially fresh and full of new outlooks.

The 41 pages of introduction of the same editor to Volume 11, "Italienische Reise, Annalen" are somewhat summary in comparison, yet, even the layman, who may wish for more elucidation on the biographical background and the conversion of letters and diary into the finished work (which he can easily find elsewhere) would hardly trade it for Beutler's discussion of G's *Natur, Kunst, Gott* and his development toward classicism, and his evolvment of a new style. Besides, he will find a good deal of what is generally expected in the *Register*, which with its 136 pages in small print is again almost a commentary.

Volume 14, "Schriften zur Literatur," includes paralipomena, drafts and sketches, which in other editions are generally relegated to the notes and variants, but in G's case are certainly necessary to round out the picture of his critical activity. Fritz Strich, the editor predestined for this task through his monograph on *Goethe und die Weltliteratur*, reviews in his first chapters the pertaining critical journals, G's table of values (antinaturalism, Einheit und Mannigfaltigkeit, symbol, clear separation of genres), the theatre and histrionic art, German literature, and then proceeds to clarify especially the concepts Weltliteratur and Weltpoesie, which play such an important part in Goethe's later interests. World poetry is the expression of an unconscious poetic gift bestowed upon people of all times and is more or less synonymous with folk poetry; World literature, on the other hand, consciously produced by the broadest spirits of a people, is a literature spanning the gulf between nations. Though the latter is a true representation of one nation's peculiar character, it contains nevertheless all the elements of common humanity and is thus especially fitted for furthering a mutual understanding and appreciation among the civilized peoples of the earth. Furthermore, Strich sets in sharp contrast G's idea of Volkslied to that of Herder and the Romanticists; finally, he discusses G's role as a mediator between classicism and romanticism, especially on the basis of his interest in the writers of the *Globe*.

Volume 23, "Gespräche. Zweiter Teil," edited by Wolfgang Pfeiffer-Belli, continues the liberal selection of conversations (Vol. 22) with the exception of those with Eckermann, which form vol. 24 of the edition (reviewed *MLN*, LXIV, 177 f.). It contains the index for both volumes (241 pp. in small print) as well as the indication of sources and a description of earlier collections. The introduction characterizes the interlocutors.

A few corrections of errors or omissions, for which I am indebted to my colleague John Craps (University of Florida), may be inserted here:

In volume 22, p. 9 there curiously appears under the year 1775 an entry with the date of September 18, 1779 concerning G's visit in Frankfurt in 1778; under the same year 75, Gespräch 117, we also find an extract from a letter of Frau von Stein of January 9, 1787. Gespräch 118 is probably misplaced as well and Gespräch 119, although mentioning Werther, is concerned with G. in Leipzig and should be inserted there.

In volume 23, pp. 884, l. 4 a t is missing in vout; p. 449, l. 8 has Moskau instead of Muskau. In the Index under *Bodmer* (p. 914, l. 7 from below) the year should be given as 1775 instead of 1779. On p. 920 under *Bürger* the year of birth should be 1747 instead of 1787. On p. 994 under *Matthieson* the reference to p. 384 should be corrected to 348. On p. 1065 under *P. L. von Stolberg* the reference to Klopstock as 107 f. is correct but is missing under Klopstock p. 976, while 110 has nothing to do with Klopstock but with a reading of Stolberg's poems. P. 1081 under *von Wedel* the year 1775 should be 1779.

Volumes 18-21, "Briefe" (for 19 see *MLN*, XLVI, 184 ff.). Of the 13,500 letters contained in the spaciouly printed *Sophienausgabe* the four volumes of our edition succeed in presenting no less than one fourth, i. e. roundly 950 letters per volume, covering the periods between 1764-86 (vol. 18), 1786-1815 (vol. 19), 1815-32 (vol. 21), while the correspondence with Schiller is given in full in volume 20. The editorial policy in each volume is somewhat different; only the *Jugendbriefe* (18) are rendered in the original spelling and punctuation for obvious reasons and they are, furthermore, provided with a special commentary on account of the many allusions to persons and happenings in G's intimate circle. This relieves the usual Register which for the two other volumes are combined in vol. 21. The editors, Ernst and Christian Beutler, father and son, complement each other's introductions with characterizations of the recipients, the principal subjects of G's interests and his changing attitude toward them, and a very detailed and elucidating analysis of G's epistolary style and art, contrasting their developments in the successive periods of his life.

Volume 20, "Briefwechsel mit Friedrich Schiller." That this "gift to the Germans, yes to mankind"—as G. calls it himself—is included in its entirety, hardly needs an explanation, let alone any excuse. Yet, the editor, Karl G. Schmid, makes these the basis of his introduction, in which he cogently contrasts the characters and endowments of the two correspondents, the principles of attraction and repulsion in their friendship, the limits of their mutual comprehension and the peculiar compass of clearly distinguishable periods in their communication. While in the first five years Schiller and his tendency toward abstraction is in the lead in their discussions, which set up the classic theories, Goethe's empiricism strengthens the foundation of their classical masterpieces in the last five years. After the initial years of compromise, mutual fertilization and progression toward a common goal, poetic production results as their fruit. But throughout Schiller's stern and aggressive spirit strives to break down the barriers of the beloved adversary, Goethe's evasive trust in Daemon and in an

enriching Tyche opposes any encroachment upon his entelechy.—The naive and sentimental types are confirmed in Schmid's analysis, though not as chronological and historical phenomena but as crystallizations of a purely typological order.

With six more volumes (2, 4, 6, 13, 15, 17) to be published in the near future the edition will be completed.

ERNST FEISE

Wolfram's Parzival. Translated into English verse with introd., notes, and connecting summaries by EDWIN H. ZEYDEL in collaboration with B. Q. MORGAN. Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press, 1951. Pp. xi + 370.

Not as a specialist intent upon a minute critical analysis have I approached this English verse-translation of Wolfram's *Parzival* by Edwin H. Zeydel in collaboration with Bayard Quincy Morgan, rather as a layman who would enjoy reading a great literary epic in a form closely approximating the original; who would like to know something of that epic's background: its author, sources, place in literature, thought content; and who would appreciate having difficult passages clarified and obscure allusions explained. As such a reader I have found the Zeydel-Morgan translation an excellent piece of work, based as it is upon sound scholarship and produced by two men who have more than a modicum of poetic talent.

The aims of the Introduction "to present the significance of Wolfram's poem both as a work of art and as a document in the history of western civilization, as well as the development of the various legends involved" have been carried out particularly well. In the historical review of the mass of theories propounded by scholars in an effort to arrive at Wolfram's sources, the reader is gratified to note the statement in no uncertain terms that *Parzival* is definitely "not a cleverly pieced-together patchwork," but "a work of art, inspired and deriving its unity from the personality of the poet himself." No matter whence the material has come, it has gone through the fire of Wolfram's soul and has been forged into a masterpiece, intricate in design, great in depth. Among others, chapter 5 commends itself, for in it the underlying deeper meaning of the epic poem is succinctly set down, so that the reader can approach his reading with understanding. Likewise the two paragraphs which treat of the relation of Wagner's opera to Wolfram's epic will be appreciated. Not only, however, do Zeydel-Morgan outline the investigations that have been made to date, they point to further explorations and inject the result of their own research on certain moot questions.

In contrast to the only other English verse-translation, that of Jessie L. Weston in 1894, this Zeydel-Morgan work has captured the spirit of Wolfram's verse to a remarkable degree. Frequently the musical quality of the lines makes reading out loud a pleasure. As the translators have stated in their Preface they have followed Wolfram in introducing trochaic verse, adjacent stresses, and a dactylic foot here and there. This helps break the monotony of the basic iambic rhythm and produces somewhat of the effect of the ruggedness of the Wolfram verse. Occasionally a limping line is the result—as in the original. Dissonant rhymes and eye-rhymes have not been avoided. A few well placed archaic words, such as 'rede' 446, 20, 'ruth' 462, 26, 'prebend' 470, 20, 'wergild' 467, 26, for instance, add flavor.—The authors showed good judgment in their prose summaries by cutting more extensively those parts of the poem less directly concerned with *Parzival*, namely the Gawan adventures in Books 7, 8, 10-13.

A welcome addition for the lay reader who comes to *Parzival* for the first time might have been a kind of genealogical table showing the interrelationship of a number of the characters in the poem.—Since Zeydel-Morgan decided to adhere to the Lachmann plan of numbering manuscript pages of 30 lines each, I wondered why they did not dispense with the superior figures for notes and refer instead to the particular line under each folio number. Such an arrangement would have been simpler and perhaps more satisfying, as superior figures, even though small, are prone to intrude.—I found only two misprints which need correction: line 18 of folio 239 is out of order in that it follows line 20 instead of preceding line 19; in 696, 5, the *me* should read *be*.

This Zeydel-Morgan verse-translation of *Parzival* no doubt will also prove useful to the student of comparative literature, since the main purpose of the work "to furnish English-speaking readers an adequate introduction to" *Parzival* has been fulfilled.

FRANCES H. ELLIS

Indiana University

Minnesangs Wende. By HUGO KUHN. (*Hermæa*, Neue Folge, vol.

1) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1952. vii + 170 pp., 7 Plates. DM 18,60.

In this, the first volume of the new series of *Hermæa*, we are presented with a study which will do much to open the way to research in a hitherto neglected field, that of the post-classical MHG lyric poetry, which has been opened only recently by the publication of the monumental edition of the *Liederdichter des 13. Jh.*

by the late Carl vKraus. Hugo Kuhn is in a singularly fortunate position with respect to this work, for he was entrusted with the final edition of the KLD (the abbreviation to which we must get accustomed) after vKraus' death, so that he has a sort of head start in the field. (At the time of the writing of this review, the *Kommentarband* was still forthcoming, so that the comprehension of certain parts of Kuhn's work was almost impossible, since he preposits all of the KLD.) The unifying thread of the whole work is contained in the last chapter (*Die Wende*), which is the most fruitful part of the entire book for the student of literary history. Kuhn formulates his empirical results as follows (p. 147): "Die entscheidenden Anstösse für die schwäbische Minnesängerschule kommen aus der Tradition der staufischen Ritterschaft. . . . Beim Einzelnen trägt Lateinisches und Französisches, Geistliches, Höfisches und Spielmännisches bei." For this reader, the most striking points were the following: 1. The minimisation of the influence of Neidhart—at least upon Burkhard von Hohenfels, 2. The development (p. 149 ff.) of Kuhn's pet theory of the legalistic bent of late MHG literature—a most fruitful field for further investigation; and most important of all perhaps, 3. the tendency of the period to reach back beyond the classical era to the *vor-höfische Zeit*, just as was being done contemporaneously in the fable, drama, and historiography. (Cf. Schirokauer, *Stammler Festschrift*, 1953, 187.)

Even if one cannot readily accept some of the author's modern psychological contentions (Burkhard as a "*psychologischer Theoretiker*" for one), one must agree with the contention (p. 153), that the Swabian poets represent ". . . in Inhalt und Form den Eintritt einer neuen 'objektiveren' Welt," as a point of departure for a reconsideration of the late Middle Ages. Kuhn's contribution is really that of a basis on which must yet be built, before the general problems of the period are clear enough to be generalised.

The main part of the book consists of three otherwise unrelated studies: "Burkhard von Hohenfels und der geblünte Stil," "Gottfried von Neifen und der deutsche Strophenbau," and "Ulrich von Winterstetten und der deutsche Leich." The first study is much in the Curtius school, and attempts to show Burkhard as a focal point of the *geblünte rede*—that mixture of Latin rhetoric and German tradition which is to be found in Wolfram (and even Gottfried), and which becomes the stigma of so much late MHG poetry; particularly in connection with allegory and the *Minnerede*. Most striking is the identification of Burkhard's thought in certain particulars—namely the "Erkenntnisfunktion des menschlichen Geistes," with the theories of the mediaeval Latin poets and rhetoricians such as Mathias of Vendôme, Eberhardus Allemanus et al. In certain individual points, such as the interpretation of poem VII (p. 37), one may have minor doubts, but in general, the treatment

of Burkhard is most enlightening; in assigning him to a position not as a mere *Epigone*, but a creative artist and a vital link in the tradition which connects Wolfram and Frauenlob. Also, Kuhn's grouping of the songs is most useful, as is the pointing up of the fact that Burkhard must be taken as a preacher of the gospel of *fröide*; the age of Reinmar is past.

The next sections on Gottfried and Ulrich cannot be dealt with in detail. The first is a metrical study of considerable worth, and the second deals with the extremely difficult field of mediaeval music. The most prominent characteristic of Neifen is his "formalism," in form and content, and an extreme *Pointierung* of his poems (p. 77), which, according to Kuhn, is typical of so much late mediaeval thought. The last study—a sort of history of the German *Leich*—falls definitely into the province of the historian of music, and is extremely involved and difficult, especially if one does not have the second volume of KLD at hand.

Finally, it might be mentioned that a bibliography, particularly of the works cited which are not primarily in the field of literary history, would be most useful, as well as a few definitions of terms etc. so that particularly the third chapter is not so unapproachable to the ordinary reader. The fact that the title is misleading is a sin of the age.

THOMAS PERRY THORNTON

The Johns Hopkins University

The Life and Works of the Troubadour Raimbaut d'Orange. Edited by WALTER T. PATTISON. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, n. d. (1952). Pp. xiv + 225.

It is odd that a troubadour of Raimbaut's stature should have waited so long for a comprehensive edition, and this one, welcome as it is, had to be put out in planograph. That of Appel,¹ done, as could be expected, with customary penetration and great care, did not pretend to be complete. The present one represents a real advance in scope and, in that respect, fills the major gaps. The area where there are observations in considerable number to be made, is that of the translations.

The strong point is the historical introduction. Printed works, like *La Pise*, "inaccessible" to Appel, were used by his successor, but more important is the patient and extensive exploration into the archives of such places as Avignon, which contributes authority to the study of the personage and his milieu. Pattison rightly

¹ Appel, C. *Raimbaut von Orange.* In *Abhandlungen d. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, n. s. XXI (1928), with separate pagination.

discounts the vernacular biography as far-reaching documentation and prefers something more solid. At the same time, in totally rejecting the *vida* as "made up almost entirely of the love affairs of the poet as invented by a biographer who knew little more than we of the real facts of the poet's life," the editor goes too far and confuses with the *razo*, against which alone the indictment, as formulated, will hold. To follow oral tradition, however perilous at times in the *vid.* is not, as in the *razo*, synonymous with outright invention. The former has often more than a kernel of truth.² There even the wording may be significant, for, instead of *las soas doas fillas*, the text reads *doas soas fillas*, 'two daughters of his,' which may lend some support to the hypothesis as to their illegitimacy.

The present reviewer does not pretend to have competence in checking up on the rest of the historical research involved. As to the literary appreciation, it might have been better to follow Jeanroy in making a greater distinction between complexity of form and obscurity of content.

The texts have been examined with the utmost conscientiousness, even for the approximately thirty-four of the forty-two poems previously edited (one, partially),³ where commendable independence is shown. A few of the criteria are scarcely the ones now current, e. g. the search for the "prototype" (p. 73, notes) or the composite base. Personally I question, as always, the utility of the stemma for Provençal lyric. The affiliations are known in most cases in advance, e. g. *CR*, *IKN*,² the trustworthiness of *a*, and so forth, while other casual connections do not have to the same degree the value of *OF* (*et encore . . .*).

The principal comments bear on the translations, where there is room for disagreement, to say the least, and where often predecessors might have been followed to advantage. The remarks are listed *seriatim*:

P. 65: The sequence 'dear, sweet and fictitious' strikes one as incongruous. Appel found the passage obscure, and therefore left a blank. I venture the following explanation: *Fingere*, according to Forcellini, can mean 'ornare'; from **finctus* (CL *fictus*) can come a shortened participle meaning 'ornate,' even possibly 'artistic.'

Ibid., v. 35: *Pretz* is not 'worth,' but 'repute' (coming from *worth*). *Joi* cannot lead to perfidy, in the troubadour ideology. Retaining *cais* (v. 36) rather read: 'I see Repute so difficult because the cowardly slanderer contends and barks and his bitter words befuddle Repute, where-

² An excellent statement is the following: "En cierto modo su autoridad (that of the *vida*) es parecida a la de un cronista medieval, que si en algún momento puede recoger informaciones inexactas, y por consiguiente cometer errores, se ocupa de personajes que han existido y de hechos que han sucedido." (Martín de Riquer, *La lírica de los trovadores*, Barcelona, 1948, p. xii.)

³ Included in these figures are poems edited from an incomplete set of MSS.

fore Joy is broken . . . so that anyone practically takes over and fishes in it.' Appel uses 'bellt' for *laira*. Pattison habitually replaces a strong word by a very weak one, as will appear later.

P. 75, v. 6: *aital* 'similar,' but to what? Rather 'suitable'? v. 8, *deviza* 'divide' by whom? Is it the "oral" audience? Rather 'explain,' according to medieval rhetoricians (as the verb can mean), the reader adding "the surplus of his sense," as Marie de France has it.

P. 76, v. 30: A more literal translation would have been stronger, e.g. 'of attaining the treasure of Pisa.' As the note indicates, this is a typical way of indicating great riches, e.g. the gold of Montpellier and many similar expressions. By the same token, p. 84, v. 35, could have preserved the original syntax, which has vigor.

P. 97, v. 29: Why should a fine longing *consume*? Appel says 'erhitzt,' which is better.

P. 101, v. 19: '... which smacks altogether of gall.' Why dilute? *Lieis* is fem. How about reference to *raca*?

P. 111, v. 41: How can *abaisse* mean 'restrain'?

P. 112, v. 7: What is so curious about *remut* (<*remutet*)?

P. 114, v. 37. Is not *vols* preterite?

P. 115, note to v. 29-30: "My world" sounds anachronistic. *Sol* does not occur in rime.

P. 126, v. 63: Assuming Pattison's reading to be correct, why not *trichan ses datz* 'cheating without dice,' (i.e. "pulling a fast one," i.e. using deceit), but, for the vigor of the text, keeping the literal rendition. Unfortunately it is not always easy to see what is doing in the MSS, since it is not clear what is being substituted for something else in the notation of the *varia lectio*, in the absence of the usual bracketing device.

P. 138, v. 11: *ab lo nas cort*, explained in the notes, is omitted from the translation. v. 21: Appel is preferable, as also in v. 11. The same for 142, str. 2, and other places not mentioned for lack of space.

P. 151, v. 153-66. Good note, suggesting a whole "Bezirkslehre" in the manner of Jost Trier.

P. 152, 2: *vuelh comensar* 'I am beginning.' Peripheral translation, as, unfortunately, elsewhere; v. 11: rather 'counsel' than 'blame'; so translates Jeanroy (*Anthol.*), which might have been cited in preference to some that were mentioned. (His exact words are 'nul ne m'en ferait démordre,' i.e. by counsel.)

P. 164, v. 23: Why should not *conduchier* be inflected, and, if so, what happens to the rime scheme? *IKd* are too close to furnish a corrective one upon the other.

P. 181, end of strophe 2: "anything that harms her of me" means what? The remarks, in view of space, are not exhaustive.

The love for *entrebescamen* characteristic of Raïmbaut could have been further exploited, notably in strophic form, e.g. pp. 178, 180, 187, especially the latter. At times there is an indication that such complicated technique exists, but without sufficient elucidation.

It is too bad that music is so rarely treated in troubadour editions. Here many of us have been guilty.

A. H. SCHUTZ

Ohio State University

The English Renaissance: Fact or Fiction? By E. M. W. TILLYARD.
 Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1952. Pp. xviii + 118.
 \$3.00.

This set of four lectures was given by Prof. Tillyard at Johns Hopkins in 1950-1951. Their author therefore runs one special risk, in addition to the usual ones. For, as lectures should, these keep the tone of the speaking voice—that hazardous, dreadful, revelatory aspect of the Public Lecture. But the tone of this book is unexceptionable. A reviewer may not say this more specifically without the brashness of patting one's betters on the head.

Chapter I introduces the problem of differentiation between Middle Ages and Renaissance by quoting and commenting on certain judgments made by earlier critics. The lecturer's deft remarks are neither smug nor patronizing, so that the commentary thus elicited is pure comedy. Perhaps in no period more than our own does critical prose suffer from the lurking hostilities born of self-defense and self-assurance; this makes more remarkable the unselfrighteousness of the demonstration in Chap. I of the bizarre results of our predecessors' habit of finding the merits of one historical period by looking at what they disliked in another. This whole portion is delicately funny, without a taint of slyness. Where the author admires, he is restrained and just; of dislikes and petulances the book is serenely free. This is so unusual that it gives a kind of direct pleasure, like good weather. The book goes on to uncover certain types of opinion or feeling attachable to 'the Renaissance' and to apply these findings to three kinds: the lyric, literary criticism, and the epic.

What it attempts is not, I think, possible. That it will be misused is I suppose certain. Ours are bad times for this sort of endeavour. One of our favoured methods, the fairly close examination of smallish units to pluck out the heart of their secret, is joined to another of our favoured methods, the juxtaposition of one such secret of inner energy to another differing kind so as to enhance our sense of the true quality of what we are looking at. But these methods have fatal drawbacks when they are used to answer questions concerning the differences between historical periods. This is why their results will inescapably be given the lie by the rest of what we know.

One such drawback is the fact that we are compelled by the method into the situation of always comparing incomparables. Prof. Tillyard quotes the mediaeval *Dies irae*, and juxtaposes a Renaissance passage (from *Julius Caesar*). In the *Dies irae* a man declares that he will have no word to say when, at the very moment of the Last Judgment, he stands before Deity itself, that there even a good man can scarcely be safe. Are we to think, from a certain speech of Antony's about Brutus, that Shakespeare would have

stood even that good man in that Presence, at that moment, and furnished him with a speech about his 'human virtue in man's own right'? If we heard the speech would our comment stop with 'how unmediaeval'? The situation is *inescapably* related to the nature of an attitude shown in a literary piece. It is inherent in the nature of the things compared that we shall find a Complaint of Christ from the cross different from Wyatt's asking of his lady not to leave him thus; we shall never know how the *periods* in which they were written differed unless we rather look at two things which have every reason but date to be alike. And this is a state of affairs which does not occur in literature; it is not the nature of the beast. Surely this is why we have to look at so very many things, making such delicate reservations regarding expectable differences, and such interminable suspensions of judgment while we await corroboration from a half a dozen disciplines whose methods admit of safer documentation—when we ask literature to answer such questions as are involved in the differentiation between historical periods.

Another drawback is the fact that differentia arrived at by these favoured methods of ours do not in truth differentiate. We find 'the mark of independent psychological experience' in a Wyatt lyric, 'no sense of the here-and-now' in a mediaeval nightingale song, 'sheer, detached natural observation' in a Surrey poem. It would not take ten minutes to think of a dozen mediaeval examples of all three—in case we are in truth trying to consider two periods, not three sets of two selected pieces. We can think we see 'an element of human consideration' in Sidney's gift of cold water that is not in Henryson's treatment of Cresseid. But if we deny the motivation of 'putting oneself in the other man's place' to all the thousands of mediaeval attempts to apply *caritas*, by the simple device of divorcing motive from principle when we look at an action to understand it, does that differentiate the Middle Ages from the Renaissance, or just differentiate us from both? Similarities pushed so far as to constitute historical data alone and in themselves are just as weak as differences when we want to walk toward a generalization with their sole aid. Bunyan's *Pilgrims Progress* is 'in the tradition of' a mediaeval allegory, but it is not one. It is one that shrank; the water was too hot.

It is not Prof. Tillyard's fault that our present tools show up as singularly inept to uses which we have been made particularly anxious to employ them in, because of yet other present concerns and knowledge. Just as we turn in defensible annoyance from the methods of history and documentation, we find ourselves pressed to answer the questions those methods left unanswered on our hands. He disclaims the method of the history of ideas, but one bugbear of that method—the necessary abstracting of single Notion from whole Context—is yowling from the nearest mere, and one paw it has left on Prof. Tillyard's shield is (to save space by using an example

already explained) that good Brutus made safe—no less—at the Last Doom by Antony's 'This was a man.' Alas, poor Yorick.

It is still less the lecturer's fault that he will probably be quoted by all those who have not had time to read the long series of works in Prof. Allen's most wisely chosen introduction. The young, and the hurried (all ages), will make the Beatitudes out of him against his will, and for all the world as though he had not meant merely to do what he so modestly says he is doing. This is the age of handbooks, Great Books, omnibooks, few books, or one poem alone without books. One would not dare to end by seeing herein our likeness to the Middle Ages and our difference from the Renaissance.

ROSEMOND TUVE

Connecticut College

Sir Walter Raleigh. A Study in Elizabethan Skepticism. By ERNEST A. STRATHMANN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Pp. 292.

Research in the history of ideas and in literary biography is seldom better justified than it is in this solidly and skilfully documented reexamination "in their Elizabethan setting of the charges of atheism which Sir Walter Raleigh's contemporaries made against him." Readers of his *History of the World* must always have known, like Kingsley, that it is a "most God-fearing and God-seeing" book; with biographers like Stebbing and Edward Thompson, they must agree that it has "swept away the old calumny of his atheism." One of the main virtues of Professor Strathmann's work is its definition of Elizabethan atheism as loosely consisting in disrespect for the Trinity, or the doctrines of the divine creation of the world, of divine providence, of the soul's immortality, of the final authority of Scripture, or of inward belief in contrast to outward conformity with religious doctrine and practice. The temptation in controversy was to dub any "dubious character or intractable opponent" an atheist. The final verdict is that Raleigh's reputation for atheism "is traceable in large part to the Catholic polemics against him, especially Parson's widely circulated attack, and to the casual usage of 'atheist' in moral censure."

Professor Strathmann's main achievement is his survey of the history and character of Elizabethan skepticism as it relates to Raleigh, and the demonstration that in the famous conversation with the Rev. Ralph Ironside at Cerne Abbas Raleigh's supposed heresy was "philosophical, not religious," and that his question there about the nature of the soul implied rebellion "against

Aristotle and school logic, not against Scripture and belief in immortality." Incidentally, it is shown that the conversation at Cerne Abbas was an episode in Raleigh's participation in the prosecution of the Jesuit, Father Cornelius. The facts, to all of which we do not yet hold the key, are clearly shown to discredit their interpretation as meaning anything except that it is a mistake to regard the Cerne Abbas inquiry as "something exceptional," or Raleigh's part in it as implying receptivity either to skeptical or Roman doctrine.

Raleigh's skepticism emerges as ancillary to his belief in Scripture as "his one unquestionable authority" in the *History*, which is "so permeated by the belief in divine justice that one cannot dismiss lightly his declaration concerning God, the creation, and the soul." Like Miss Wiley, Professor Strathmann would recognize Raleigh's skepticism as having "an ultimate and eternal justification" in the quest of the "overarching wisdom of God." Unlike her, however, he challenges the scholars who are misled by Montaigne's indebtedness to Sextus Empiricus into finding "in the *Essais* the source of Raleigh's *The Skeptic*." In a sound bibliographical examination of that work the question of its relation to the English translation of Sextus, which R. B. McKerrow believed had been made about 1590, is left unsettled, but Raleigh's brief and fragmentary rendering of Sextus in *The Skeptic* is treated as isolated and significant only in helping to place its author in the line of contemporary skeptics of Academic rather than Pyrrhonic tendency who shared Raleigh's conviction that Aristotelian 'principles' must yield to reason which, in turn, should yield only to scriptural authority.

It follows, then, that Professor Strathmann cannot agree with Miss M. C. Bradbrook that, "The Preface to *The History of the World* reiterates the substance of *The Skeptic* in a condensed form, or with any of the champions of the theory of a School of Night to which Marlowe and Raleigh belonged together with a group of free-thinkers who approved the former's "alleged anti-scriptural and anti-clerical utterances." "The fundamental error in all these statements" is found to be their indifference to the fact that, "when Raleigh himself brings skeptical arguments to bear upon religion, as in the Preface to the *History*, it is to support the Christian faith, not to question its tenets. Demolition of the theory of the School of Night is not controversially overstressed, but it is the object of a double attack on grounds of the consistently religious temper of Raleigh's 'atheism' and on those of the doubtfulness of the association of Raleigh with George Chapman and Sir George Carey, the later Baron Hunsdon. Professor Strathmann insists upon the awkwardness of Carey's association with Marlowe and Raleigh in a group supposed to be opposed to Shakespeare when, "from 1594 until 1603 Shakespeare's dramatic company was under

the patronage of a Carey: under Henry, first Baron Hunsdon and Lord Chamberlain, until his death in 1596; then, as 'Hunsdon's men,' under Sir George Carey."

The great value of the present study of Raleigh lies in its trustworthy and elaborate charting of his position on the map of Elizabethan thought. Without overstress of the fact that "his attitude toward Aristotle is usually denunciatory," we are shown the relation of his dominant skepticism to the anti-Aristotelianism of men like Vives and Ramus. While it is acknowledged that he "showed a decided preference for the teachings of Plato and the Platonists," no encouragement is offered to the theory that he was a serious precursor of the Cambridge Platonists. He emerges as a Christian skeptic—almost as a Christian apologist; yet he "appeals to reason, which the skeptic distrusts." He was "scandalized with atheism," and "charges of atheism, in any sober Elizabethan sense . . . , cannot be made to stick." He properly takes his place at the focus of a circle which is most brightly lighted by apologetic works like the *Trueness of the Christian Religion* of Philip de Mornay, the Protestant Frenchman, and the *Responsio* of Robert Parsons, the Jesuit, in their many redactions. The striking thing about such Roman and Protestant works of Christian apology was the extent of common ground among them, as Professor Strathmann points out. If there is a defect in his discussion of them, it is in failing to explore their interrelations and provenience further than he does—back to St. Thomas. But at every point the documentation is ample to sustain his interpretation of Raleigh's thought.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

University of Wisconsin

Elizabethan Poetry. By HALLETT SMITH. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. viii + 355. \$5.00.

In recent times the historical approach to literature has not been popular with scholars. Aside from chapters in cooperative surveys there has not been a history of Elizabethan literature since Saintsbury's in 1887. The book now under review also disclaims the historical method. Professor Smith's object is to explain and illustrate the context of "ideals, values, commonplaces or conventions" which lie behind the poetry. As a result, most of the chapters begin with exposition of ideas or conventions or social backgrounds and only gradually arrive at the poetry. This way of dealing with the material is most successful in the sections on pastoral poetry and on the Ovidian tales, least successful in satire

and epic. The chapter on sonnet sequences, the most original and most rewarding chapter in the book, makes no attempt to give a "context" for Elizabethan sonnets but proceeds immediately to a discussion of the literature itself. Here one feels that the author has been primarily and vitally concerned with the poets and their poetry, with a corresponding gain in the interest and persuasiveness of his writing.

In general the contextual material in this book is overdone in relation to the size of the book. Without room enough to give a complete "history of ideas" for each context, Smith gives us too much to be comfortably swallowed as introductory material. Combined with what I must reluctantly describe as a lack of feeling for the poetry itself (except in the chapter on the sonnet and in the discussion of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*) this over-weighting of background material makes the book rather dull in many places. On the other hand, in the chapter on the pastoral there is insufficient explanation of the earlier Renaissance eclogue tradition of criticism of contemporary affairs under the cover of shepherds' talk.

In spite of these defects the book has many virtues. It is organized with admirable clarity. The several kinds of pastoral are differentiated, as are the two different traditions of satire. In his discussion of ideas the author almost always picks the right ones to discuss, and his interpretation of the purpose and meaning of the various kinds of poetry seems to me very sound. His grasp of modern scholarship in the field is generally sure and his judgment good, although I think that his discussion of the *Faerie Queene* would have profited from a realization of the light which Mrs. Bennett's book throws on that poem. Another meritorious feature is the inclusion of a chapter on "Poetry for Music." Here the importance of realizing the nature of the musical setting of many Elizabethan lyrics is shown. The chapter is no substitute for reading Kastendieck and Bruce Pattison, and it unfortunately never prints any of the musical scores discussed, but its presence in the book is reason for congratulation.

All Elizabethan scholars will want to read this book, and they will find many parts of it profitable for their own thinking. But because of its lack of historical or biographical material and its failure (with the exceptions noted above) to present a really stimulating appreciation of the poetry itself it will not be a useful book for assignment to students or for recommendation to the general reader.

LEICESTER BRADNER

Brown University

French Dramatic Literature in the Reign of Henri IV. By L. E. DABNEY, Austin, Texas: The University Cooperative Society, 1952. Pp. 472. \$3.25.

With the exception of Marsan's work on the pastoral, studies of Montchrestien and Billard, and the republication of a few plays, little has been written about the subject that Dr. Dabney treats, and no one has treated it, except superficially, as a whole. His book consequently brings to light much in the period 1589 to 1610 that has been overlooked. He has discussed over 150 plays, giving extensive analyses and many quotations.¹ These plays are taken up chronologically within groups entitled Biblical plays; saints' lives; propaganda plays; those using Greek or Latin history or literature; those from novels or tales; those, other than pastorals, from Italian sources; those from histories other than Greek and Latin classics; "tragedies or tragi-comedies from miscellaneous material; tragi-comedies, pastorals and pastoral eclogues used solely as literary material, and finally, miscellaneous semi-dramatic works such as pageants, *colloques*, etc." (p. 4).

The book is printed by direct off-set; most of the manual labor involved was supplied by the author himself. As a result many errors have crept in that would probably have been avoided if a more orthodox method of presentation had been employed. This, however, does not gainsay the fact that there should be a copy of the book in all institutions that make a serious study of French drama in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The following comments may be of some use to those who acquire copies of the work.

The failure to discuss Hardy's extant plays may be defended on the ground that they may have been first acted after 1610, but, as it is by no means sure that all of them were, there should be some discussion of this question. I find no mention of C. B. Beall's *Fortune du Tasse en France* in the discussion of plays derived from the *Jerusalem* or the *Aminta*. *Alidor*, a pastoral play discovered by Miss Fraser and erroneously attributed by her to Pierre Corneille, might have been mentioned, as it was probably written about 1600.

P. 12, in the Bible there is no suggestion that Uriah believed his wife to be unfaithful; p. 20, nor does the Bible relate that Rebekah was instructed by a dream; p. 23, second line of the quotation, *read* Tu veux, tu veux; pp. 48-50, Jeanne d'Arc should not be put among the saints, for she did not win this distinction before the twentieth century; p. 60, the Diogenes reference must come from Rabelais's *Tiers Livre* or its source in Lucian; p. 76, first line of the second quotation, *read* brécher, fendre, occire (cf. the *Catalogue de Soleinne*, no. 920); p. 139, note 19, *read* Olénix; p. 142, second line of first quotation, *read* issue; tenth line of second quotation, *read* avecque; p. 143, second line of the quotation, *read* gaigné; p. 144, second

¹ These reveal such phrases as *se mouche du pied* (1604, p. 86) and *je ne sçay quoy* (1601, p. 108) that are early examples of their use in modern French.

line of the quotation, *read* n'eut; p. 171, second line of second quotation, *read* grand or grand'; p. 183, last line of the quotation, *read* traisons (given by the *Catalogue Solenne*, no. 878, and required by prosody); p. 198, note 4, Arnault's *Lucrèce*, acted at the Comédie Française in 1792, should not be called a "possible play"; p. 219, there should be a reference to Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils collectifs de Poésies*, III, 192-4; p. 221, second quotation, line 2, *read* d'une; p. 223, third quotation, *read* ton cœur; p. 236, quotation, the idea, expressed in Brantôme, goes back to the Greeks; note 13, for Aristo *read* Ariste; p. 248, first line of first quotation *read* je ne puis; p. 253, first line of third quotation, for Je tiens *read* Je le tien; p. 268, line 1, *read* Du Perron; p. 298, line 8 of second quotation, *read* heureuse perdant; p. 324, line 5 of fourth quotation *read* user ainsi de moy; line 15, *read* dessus la place; p. 343, in connection with pageants, G. R. Kernodle's *From Art to Theatre* might have been mentioned; p. 350, line 6 of third quotation, *read* gayement; pp. 372-3, for an explanation of "pentagones" that are not pentagons, but decorations with five sides in addition to top and bottom, cf. my article in *RSS*, XVI, 335; p. 386, line 4 of first quotation, *read* les feres; note 66, *read* le sujet.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

The Prologues and Epilogues of John Dryden. A Critical Edition.

By WILLIAM BRADFORD GARDNER. New York: Columbia University Press, for the University of Texas, 1951. Pp. xii + 361. \$4.50.

This edition reprints all the prologues and epilogues known to have been written by Dryden, with a few not certainly by him—a hundred and two poems in all. Besides the text, the volume includes extensive textual and explanatory notes, an introduction, two appendices on problems of authorship, an index of first lines, and a general index. Editor and publisher have combined to produce a handsome, readable, and useful book.

The dust-jacket, asserting that Dryden's text "has been appallingly garbled because of the conjectural emendations of his editors," suggests that Gardner presents for the first time "what Dryden actually wrote rather than what his editors thought he should have written." This claim has some justification as applied to the Scott-Saintsbury text, but it is not defensible as to Dryden's later editors. Gardner's editorial policy is somewhat different from that of Noyes and Summers. He bases his texts on "the last edition known to have been revised by the author himself," reproducing it *verbatim et literatim*; Noyes follows the same policy but modernizes spelling, capitalization, and punctuation, while Summers does not modernize but prints from the first editions, with later variants recorded (rather capriciously and incompletely) in textual notes. Apart from Noyes' modernization, these policies come to much the same thing in practice, for Dryden was not, like Pope, an assiduous

improver of his own works; in most cases, all three editors base their texts on the earliest edition. Since I have not been able to consult the original editions, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of any of these texts, but of the first twenty poems printed by Gardner, eight show small verbal differences between his text and that of Noyes, Summers, or both.¹ These variants do not seriously affect the sense, and neither Noyes nor Summers can be said to have garbled the text by conjectural emendations. Gardner's version, though a good one as far as I can judge, is not conspicuously new.

The notes, covering 153 pages, are conveniently arranged in a separate section. They represent a collection and synthesis of present knowledge relating to the prologues and epilogues. The source of the text is stated for each poem, with the reasons for choosing it, and the date of first production of the relevant play is established from the *Stationers' Register*, *Term Catalogues*, or other standard authorities. To these fundamental facts are added remarks on the play by Pepys, Evelyn, and other contemporaries of Dryden, commentaries by critics and scholars from Johnson and Malone to Thorn-Drury, Summers, Van Doren, and MacDonald, and longer explanatory notes on special problems. The comments on astrology (pp. 188-190), on the fad for Persian "vests" (199-200), on Dryden's relations to Rochester (227-228), and on "fanaticks" (247) are typical examples of this last sort of note. Individual words are glossed, for the most part, by the appropriate *NED* definitions. Here, too, there is nothing really new.

As Gardner says (xvi-xvi), these small poems are "the cream of Dryden's occasional verse"; they are worthy of close study both in their own right and also as a rich source of information about Dryden's interests and opinions and the life and thought of his time. Gardner's workmanlike edition, providing in a single handy volume everything that is needed to understand and appreciate these prologues and epilogues, will therefore be welcomed by students of Dryden and of the Restoration period generally.

HOYT TROWBRIDGE

University of Oregon

¹ Pr. *Wild Gallant* "as first acted," l. 29: *Lifes* (G), *the life's* (N, S).
 Ep. *Indian Queen*, l. 15: *at* (G), *on* (N, S).
 Pr. *Rival Ladies*, l. 3: *the* (G), *they* (N, S).
 Ep. *Indian Emperour*, l. 8: *Who* (G, N), *That* (S, from 1st ed.; *Who* given as variant).
 Pr. *Sir Martin Mar-All*, l. 4: *costs* (G, S), *cost* (N).
 Pr. *Albumazar*, l. 8: *this* (G), *his* (N); not printed by S.
 Pr. *Evening's Love*, l. 30: *an* (G, N), *a* (S).
 Pr. *Conquest of Granada*, Pt. I, l. 29: *great* (G, N), *grear* (S).
 Same, l. 30: *gardens* (G, S), *garden* (N).

Horace ou Naissance de l'homme. Par LOUIS HERLAND. [Paris]:
Les Editions de minuit, 1952. Pp. 213.

Corneille's *Horace* has, according to M. Herland, two plots, eventually connected, one concerned with Camille, the other with Horace. The first is the older type of tragedy resulting in the death of heroine or hero, exemplified by *Sophonisbe*, *Mariane*, *Lucrèce*, *Mort de César*. It gives the first example in the history of French tragedy of a girl as heroine rather than a married woman. The other and major plot is distinctly Cornelian, the "tragédie de l'épreuve."

The protagonist has been misunderstood by actors, audiences, and professors, even, perhaps, by Corneille himself. Horace is not a brutal fanatic. He is at first presented as "la plus pure et la plus sainte figure de héros" (p. 146) with "les sentiments les plus délicats envers sa sœur." He is devoted to Curiace and seeks to make him rejoice with him in the honor that has been conferred on them of cutting each other's throat. It is because Curiace is incapable of rising to his moral height that he renounces him in "Albe vous a nommé, je ne vous connais plus." But he suffers deeply. His show of bravado is assumed in order to cover up his emotion. After he has killed his friend, he suffers more than Camille (p. 168). So much is this the case that he seeks to put away all thought of Curiace, but she names him and at the same time belittles Rome. Can she be right? If so, Horace has killed his friend in an evil cause. He must not think such things. She must not make him doubt. She must be out of his way. "Va dans les enfers plaindre ton Curiace."

He never admits that he has done wrong. He merely leaves the matter to his father and to his king:

Et le plus innocent devient soudain coupable
Quand aux yeux de son prince il paraît condamnable.

This is interpreted as an ironical attack upon the principle of monarchy, but Tullus fails to get the point and pardons this "guerrier trop magnanime," who now, through suffering, has become a man, the first protagonist in French tragedy to be a man rather than a hero, hence the sub-title of the book.

M. Herland has read Corneille with great care, but he has neglected his contemporaries. To claim that Camille is the first girl heroine is to forget Iole in Rotrou's *Hercule mourant*, the title-role in his *Antigone*, Lydie in Du Ryer's *Alcionée*, etc. To present as a noble hero a man who rejoices in being called upon to fight against his friend and who not only kills his sister but is not displeased with himself for having done so recalls the exaltation of force that we used to hear from the Nazis. Yet M. Herland cannot himself hold their doctrines, for no Nazi would

give an ironical interpretation to the words spoken by Horace to his king. They appear in a play dedicated to Richelieu, no place for irony at the expense of monarchs, especially from a dramatist who declared that he was "entièrement redevable" to the Cardinal for his reputation. Nor do I think that Horace is the first French protagonist to become a man through suffering. Hérode, who kills his wife as Horace kills his sister and is certainly a man rather than a hero, had appeared in two French tragedies before *Horace*.

I must add, however, that M. Herland presents his interpretation of the play with force and subtlety. His book is well worth the attention even of those whose academic training prevents their agreeing with him.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Elements of Critical Theory (Perspectives in Criticism: 1). By WAYNE SHUMAKER. Berkeley: University of California Press: 1952. Pp. x + 131. \$2.75.

The outcome of this brief study of critical theory is that one's system of values is intimately connected with one's basic philosophy and that one's basic philosophy is a development of a "root-metaphor," a term invented by Professor S. C. Pepper of the University of California. According to Mr. Pepper there are only four root-metaphors which eventuate in four systems of metaphysics: mechanism, formism, organism, and contextualism. Organistic and formistic philosophies emphasize the formal properties of art; mechanistic and contextualistic philosophies emphasize "the ability of art to evoke sensations" (p. 99). For further details, one should consult Mr. Pepper's *World Hypotheses*. Since Mr. Shumaker does not believe that a critic need be aware of his basic philosophy, it is difficult to see just what good it does to spend time elaborating it. In what sense of the word an unconscious assumption is an element in a theory deserves some clarification, for logically it is possible that a statement be implied by two or more contrary propositions. And when one is trying to discover the unconscious ideas which a man may or may not hold, one is by the very nature of the problem forced to work backwards from conclusion to premises.

Mr. Shumaker, moreover, wastes a good deal of space on dictionary definitions of the word "criticism." Such definitions are bound to lead to greater and greater confusion for the simple reason that dictionaries present collections of the various ways in which a term is used and nothing more. In a study of this type, however, an author has simply to tell his readers how he proposes to use the

term under discussion and not create the illusion that a term has some "real" meaning which can be derived from its meanings in use. We already know that the term "criticism" is ambiguous; if we did not, there would be no need for books about its purposes and problems. If Brownell had one definition of "criticism" and Brunetière another, all one can conclude is that these two gentlemen were attempting to do two different things. There is no more need to find a common element in what they are doing or even to explain why they are not both doing the same thing than there is to find a common element in what an organic chemist and a physical chemist do. People study different problems and critics are no different from anyone else on that score. It is true that literary critics severally think—or at least say—that their individual methods and goals are the eminently correct and valuable methods and goals, but that is a problem for the psychologist, not for the aesthetician.

Mr. Shumaker's book, in spite of these apparent defects, will prove interesting to one who disagrees with the remarks above and who thinks that there is one purpose in all criticism, whatever the facts may be. For the study is a careful analysis, well documented, and argued with some cogency. The outcome, as was stated above, is that critics are in duty bound to make as clear as possible their philosophic point of view, for their conclusions have force only relatively to that point of view. Thus though Mr. Shumaker does not end with complete pluralism, he does end with a sort of fourfold pluralism. That may be pluralistic enough for monists and monistic enough for pluralists to find fault with.

GEORGE BOAS

The Johns Hopkins University

Pope and the Heroic Tradition: A Critical Study of His Iliad. By

DOUGLAS KNIGHT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951.

Pp. viii + 123. \$3.00.

By the time Pope set himself the task of translating the *Iliad*, no genre was so universally revered as the epic. Its great practitioners had demonstrated its magnificent possibilities, and critics had anatomized it so thoroughly that not even the slightest detail of its structure was any longer a secret. In translating the *Iliad* Pope faced not only the basic and difficult problem of rendering Homer's substance and Homer's poetry into English; he had also the task of presenting it within the framework of this almost sacred tradition. How did he meet this challenge? What is there in the translation, in both the poetry and the critical apparatus, which will lead us to an understanding of Pope as an epic poet in the great tradition? Mr. Knight has attempted to answer these and many other questions, and he had answered them very well.

For Pope Homer was the great poet of originality, of fire and invention; and his *Iliad* was the great example of the superb epic. In his critical remarks Pope is constantly emphasizing these qualities, and he supports his judgments by reference to the traditional paraphernalia of literary criticism. But, as Mr. Knight makes plain, Pope is not content to rest his case on this desiccated framework. He is ever returning to the moving genius of Homer, and he interprets the epic genre in terms of the accrued and living tradition of Virgil, Spenser, Milton, and Dryden. His *Iliad* is an *Iliad* of the epic tradition down to his own day.

In his style as well as his theory, this intimate relationship to tradition is apparent. Pope avoids language that seems strange and odd, but he uses terms with an unusual flavor, particularly Miltonic ones, and through them reassures the reader that the poem is within the bounds of the heroic tradition. Furthermore, as Mr. Knight demonstrates in detailed analyses of selected passage, Pope manipulates his generalized language in such a way that it has power and suggestion even while it seems to be carrying the reader along in the well known epic ways.

Pope's *Iliad* was appealing to the eighteenth-century reader because in its total effect it made him feel at home. This is not to say that Pope so perverted Homer that Achilles and Ulysses were made to seem like English gentlemen of the eighteenth century. Far from it. But Pope did make his reader feel that the Homeric world though alien to his own was at the same time like his own. This effect he achieved through his use of traditional devices, through his manipulation of language, and especially through his heightening of the philosophic implications of the poem. Mr. Knight convincingly points out that the meaning of the poem was enhanced by a subtle heightening of concepts which were a part of the eighteenth-century consciousness. Thus Pope increased the interdependence of man and nature over what is in the Greek; he developed heroic morality beyond what is in Homer; and, using the tradition of Virgil and Milton, he expanded the concepts of divine power and divine justice. Was Pope's Homer then Pope or Homer? Mr. Knight's answer would be that it was Homer, the Homer who had descended to Pope through the tradition of European poetry and thought.

This book is an excellent example of the fusion of historical scholarship and critical analysis. The scholarship is sound and indispensable. If at times the critical analyses seem attenuated with the discovery of "imaginary beauties," they are usually stimulating and revealing. With Mr. Knight's book in print, future critics will condescend to Pope's Homer at their peril.

H. T. SWEDENBERG, JR.

University of California,
Los Angeles

Pope and His Critics: A Study in Eighteenth Century Personalities.

By W. L. McDONALD. London: J. M. Dent; Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1951. Pp. 340. \$4.50.

In *Work in Progress* (1939) Professor McDonald staked out a project on "Pope criticism as a criterion of taste during two centuries." The present book concludes with Joseph Warton, and the study of a criterion of taste seems largely to have given place to an observation of the animosities of individual authors. Outstanding merits are the sympathetic approach to Pope's poetry and fresh interpretations of special subjects. The analysis of the pastorals of Pope and Philips is excellent; the chapter on Johnson is very good within its limits; and the account of Warton, although most of it is not new, is well presented.

The book as a whole is less satisfactory than such parts. It includes two previous articles, one of which, "Augustan Personalities," provides a long and distracting introduction. The author seems uncertain of the meaning attached to either term. "Augustan" includes Oldmixon but excludes Defoe, and it takes in Clarendon—who died in the same year with Milton. "Personality" or "personalities" has three meanings within seven pages: personal character (p. 33); individual differences (p. 36); and disparaging or offensive remarks (p. 39). On p. 4 the chief quality of the Augustans was "their urbanity"; on p. 12 it seems that "the Augustans *par excellence*, were an irascible, cantankerous company." Likewise on p. 222 we are told that no proof of Warburton's tampering with Pope's text has been offered, but on p. 276 reference is made to Professor Griffith's exposure of the manipulation of *An Essay on Criticism*.

A lover of poetry may wonder why Gay is a secondary Augustan when the hollow literary qualities of Bolingbroke merit first rank. The Biblical name of Bezaleel Morris needs no quotation marks. Pope's Catholicism is almost overlooked as the source of many "personalities" and the first cause of his quarrel with Cibber. Too much attention is given to well-flogged dead horses (such as "A Popp upon Pope"); too little to numerous less familiar passages in journals or pamphlets. For instance, no mention is made of Benjamin Defoe or of "H. Stanhope" (Hugh Stanhope; i. e., William Bond). The interesting articles in *Mist's Weekly Journal* (when mentioned at all) come in as citations from Nichols or Lounsbury or the ever-present Elwin-Courthope. No reference is made to Professor Sherburn's forthcoming edition of the correspondence.

One may question the basic assumption that Pope's victims were always motivated by jealousy and pique and that Pope condemned them only because they wrote badly (p. 67). Dr. Johnson lived

long enough to refer to Walpole as "a fixed star" and to dismiss the patriotism of Bolingbroke and his temporary allies as "the last refuge of a scoundrel." It is interesting to speculate on what might have appeared in still another version of *The Dunciad* if Pope had survived to read what Bolingbroke wrote of him in 1749 or to see Warburton's improved text of *An Essay upon Criticism*.

It remains true that before Johnson most criticism of Pope (like much criticism by Pope) was warped by personal bias. Professor McDonald has done well to point out so much of this once more.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

Indiana University

Voltaire's Notebooks, edited, in large part for the first time, by

THEODORE BESTERMAN. 2 vols. Geneva: Institut et Musée Voltaire, Les Délices, 1952. Pp. x + 506. (Publications de l'Institut et Musée Voltaire, Série Voltaire, I.).

These two volumes reproduce the small Leningrad notebook, published by N. L. Torrey in *MP*, but including three paragraphs omitted there and now supplied by Professor Torrey; the Cambridge notebook, not previously published; the *sottisier*; two Paris notebooks, one of them apparently transcribed by Wagnière; notebooks and fragments published after Voltaire's death by Joseph Piccini, son of the composer; and other fragments from various sources. The texts have been carefully edited by Mr. Besterman, who has kept the originals as far as he could, except in such minor matters as capitalization and the addition of accents. He has often pointed out repetitions from one notebook to another, has explained many obscure passages, and has given much information about allusions and about the relation of certain phrases in the notebooks to other compositions by Voltaire. Mr. Besterman traces in his introduction the history of the notebooks and explains his editorial methods.

Voltaire's text is in French, English, Italian, and Latin. Much of it is taken from the writings or conversation of others. Just how much is his own it is impossible to say. Nor can the date of an entry usually be determined. It is consequently difficult to determine whether the entries indicate the germs of essays, novels, and plays, or whether they are descended from these or from their sources. They tell us, at least, much about Voltaire's reading, his interests, and the jests that amused him when no censor was at his elbow. The following remarks will, I hope, help in a small way to complete Mr. Besterman's notes.

P. 82, "Mr La Motte errs about the temple in *Andromache*." This is apparently a comment upon La Motte's contention that it would take no

longer to see what happens in the temple than to hear it described; cf. "Suite . . . où l'on répond à M. de Voltaire," in La Motte's *Œuvres*, Paris, 1754, iv, 432. P. 106, for the presentation of *Absalon* in the apartments of Mme de Maintenon cf. Dangeau, *Journal*; he gives the nobleman who played the title-role as Ayen rather than Anjou. P. 107, note 6. Moland is wrong. Du Perrier or Du Pérrier is the name. He introduced into Paris the "pompe à incendie" in 1699 and left the troupe to devote himself to fire prevention in 1705; cf. my *Sunset*, p. 12. For evidence that he had been Molière's servant cf. G. Monval, *Le Laquais de Molière*, Paris, 1887. P. 140, the poem that Voltaire assigns to St Gelais was published in 1607 and is attributed by Lachèvre to Desportes; cf. his *Recueils . . . satiriques*, Paris, 1914, pp. 166, 419. P. 168 and note 3, *ost* does not mean *hôte*, but an armed camp. P. 170, fourth line from the end of the text, a question-mark, rather than a comma, should be inserted. P. 171, line 3, should not "Diomède" read "Nicomède"? P. 180, first stanza, for the authorship of *Tibère* and its attribution to Du Puy cf. my *French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire*, pp. 112-3. In the next stanza the first word omitted must be *hère*. P. 234, first item, the story of the woman who would burn heaven and quench hell, subsequently reproduced by Stendhal, is found in Joinville and in an eighteenth-century Arab mystic; cf. the article by Miss Czoniczer in *MLN*, LX (1945), 525-7. P. 235 and 486, Voltaire declares that the story, given here, about the duc de Guise was employed by him in the dénouement of *Alzire*; cf. the Moland edition, xxxiii, 471. P. 248, second paragraph, there should be a reference to the third chapter of *Zadig*, to Ascoli's edition, and to an article by H. Loss in *MLN*, LII (1937), 576-7. Pp. 301, 303, "les plus courtes folies sont les meilleures," cf. the last verse of Beys's *Illustres Fous* and the note on it in M. I. Protzman's edition, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1942. P. 314, Voltaire is mistaken in saying that Mlle Bernard made "le consul Brutus amoureux." P. 398, "La Béjard disait qu'elle ne se consolait jamais de la perte de ses deux bons amis: l'un était Gros René, et l'autre le cardinal de Richelieu." The date given by Moland is correct, for it is found in the *Registre* of La Grange as Nov. 4, 1664; "La Béjard" must refer to Madeleine and cannot refer to Molière's wife. It is true that Madeleine did not die until 1672, but, as she became an actress before the Cardinal died, there could have been scandal about their relations; I think, however, that Voltaire or the person he may be quoting must have confused her with someone else, for there is no other evidence that Madeleine had such lofty aspirations.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

BRIEF MENTION

The Art of Sinking in Poetry: Martinus Scriblerus' "ΠΕΡΙ ΒΑΘΟΥΣ." Ed. by EDNA LEAKE STEEVES. New York: King's Crown Press, 1952. Pp. lxxii + 207. \$3.75. The editor of *Peri Bathous* has obviously enjoyed her task, for she writes with verve and displays a sharp curiosity about every aspect of her subject. The reader, however, may well be inclined to sympathize with Pope's Scriblerian protest against the kind of scholarship that spins small its slender store. The preface traces once again the history of the Scriblerus Club; reexamines the authorship of the essay

to leave the question as vaguely answered as it always has been; concludes that *Peri Bathous* and the *Dunciad* are related works; and, with some irrelevance, examines Pope's general debt to Longinus. More central problems, especially the satiric method of *Peri Bathous*, and the relation of its rhetorical theory of the "profound" to Pope's verse, satiric and otherwise, are not touched on, despite the clue in Pope's statement to Spence that the work "may be very well worth reading seriously, as an art of rhetoric." The commentary on the text, like the preface, is often very helpful, but is nevertheless excessive. The readers of this edition are not likely to require yet another set of detailed biographical sketches of the Dunces; no apparent end is served by confirming Pope's references to the sources of his quotations; and such passages as a statement about the wrong end of a perspective glass hardly require elucidation through a note about the new science, the Royal Society, and Galileo.

The text is an excellent facsimile of the first edition; and the volume ends with an admirably meticulous bibliographical note by Mrs. Steeves and R. H. Griffith.

EARL R. WASSERMAN

The Divine Poems. By JOHN DONNE. Edited with introduction and commentary by HELEN GARDNER. Oxford and New York: OUP, 1953. Pp. xcvi + 147. \$5.00. In this new edition Miss Gardner alters our previous conceptions of the text and order of Donne's divine poems. After a careful scrutiny of the printed and manuscript texts, she comes very logically to the conclusion that the 1633 edition represents better than do the manuscripts the form in which Donne wished his poems to be printed. In addition to this, Miss Gardner has sometimes used the more authoritative manuscript groups to obtain readings that consort better with the sense or the metrics. She has likewise rearranged the Holy Sonnets so that they make a more impressive harmony of sense and passion. The annotations with which the text is supplied are rather impressive. With few exceptions, necessary explanations are given from Donne's other works or from authorities current in the early seventeenth century. The notes are quite economical and do not, as is often the case, bog the reader down in masses of useless detail. Several problems that require extended discussion are treated in a series of appendices. The total impression that one has after reading through the edition is that of industrious care governed by good sense.

D. C. A.

The Life and Adventures of La Rochefoucauld. By MORRIS BISHOP. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1951. Pp. xii + 282. \$3.75. This is a well-written biography of La Rochefoucauld, his loves, his wars, his disillusionment, and his retreat to the society of Mme de Sablé and Mme de La Fayette. Much is made of the *Astrée* as giving La R. the conception of romantic behavior that was to be shattered by his subsequent contact with reality.¹ The *Maximes* are presented as personal confessions, resulting in large measure from his misfortunes. Two hundred and forty-two of them in translation are worked into the text, "usually without quotation marks or other acknowledgment" (p. ix). They give a didactic flavor that recalls La R. The book is well printed, elegantly bound, prefaced by a handsome portrait of La R. It makes a pleasing contribution, unencumbered by foot-notes, to American works that deal with men of the French seventeenth century.

H. C. L.

Stendhal, Henri III, Un Acte inédit avec introduction et commentaire par J. F. MARSHALL. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952. Pp. xii + 86. \$3.00. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, xxxvi, No. 4.) The late Edouard Champion had in his possession a manuscript containing the third act of a play by Stendhal on Henri III's difficulties in Paris and probably his flight from the city and his murder. Champion's daughter, Mme Jean Loubet, gave Mr. Marshall permission to edit and publish this fragment. In doing so he shows that Stendhal had the subject in mind as early as 1823, that he composed this act in 1828, and that, in writing it, he made use, not only of historical works, but of two plays by Vitet, *Les Barricades* and *Les Etats de Blois*. Mr. Marshall makes no mention of *La Mort de Henri III ou les Ligueurs* by Charles d'Outrepoint, a *drame* published in 1826 that may also have been utilized. Though the manuscript presented considerable difficulty, the edition has been excellently prepared and printed. It is unfortunate that what has been so handsomely presented is so little rewarding. If one may judge from a single act, one must realize that Stendhal did not have *la tête dramatique*.

H. C. L.

¹ This may be the case if La Rochefoucauld left out the parts of the *Astrée* that are not all sweetness, the parts that Bishop does not mention, but he seems fond of referring to "pastoral trappings," as he does on p. 237, assigning them there to Mlle de Scudéry, though she never composed pastoral novels or plays.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Crane, Melville.—*Making a Poem: an Inquiry into the Creative Process.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1953. Pp. xi + 108. \$2.95.

Donne, John.—*Sermons.* Vol. 1. Ed. by George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1953. Pp. xiv + 354. \$7.50.

Hall, John.—*The Advancement of Learning* (1649). Ed. by A. K. Croston. Liverpool: University Press, 1953. Pp. xiv + 54. 5/-. (Liverpool Reprints, 7.)

Highet, Gilbert.—*People, Places, and Books.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. x + 277. \$3.50.

Irving, Edward B., Jr. (ed.).—*The Old English "Exodus."* New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. viii + 131. \$5.00. (Yale Studies in English, 122.)

Jepsen, Laura.—*Ethical Aspects of Tragedy.* A comparison of certain tragedies by Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Seneca and Shakespeare. Gainesville: U. of Fla. Press, 1953. Pp. x + 130. \$3.75.

Nicoll, Allardyce (ed.).—*Shakespeare Survey.* Vol. 6. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. viii + 185. \$3.75.

Nitchie, Elizabeth.—*Mary Shelley.* New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. xiv + 255. \$4.00.

Nowell, Laurence.—*Vocabularium Saxonice.* Ed. by Albert H. Marckwardt. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1952. Pp. ix + 198. \$5.00.

Ostrom, John.—*The Craft of Composition.* New York: Henry Holt, 1953. Pp. xiv + 441. \$3.40.

Pearce, Roy H.—*The Savages of America, a Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1953. Pp. xv + 252. \$4.00.

Simms, William G.—*Letters.* Vol. 2. Ed. by M. C. S. Oliphant, A. T. Odell, T. C. D. Eaves. Columbia, S. C.: Univ. of South Carolina Press, 1953. Pp. xxix + 610. \$8.50.

Sisan, Kenneth.—*Studies in the History of Old English Literature.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. Pp. vi + 314. \$6.00.

Small, Harold A.—*The Field of his Fame. A Ramble in the Curious History of Charles Wolfe's Poem "The Burial of Sir John Moore."* Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ.

of California Press, 1953. Pp. 49. \$.75. (Univ. of California Publications, English Studies, 5.)

Wasserman, Earl R.—*The Finer Tone: Keats' Major Poems.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953. Pp. 228. \$4.00.

Wicker, C. V.—*Edward Young and the Fear of Death.* Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1952. Pp. 108. \$1.00. (Univ. of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, 10.)

GERMAN

Braune, Wilhelm.—*Abriss d. althochdeutschen Grammatik mit Berücksichtigung des Altsächsischen.* 9. Aufl. bearbeitet v. Karl Helm [Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken german. Dialekte. C: Abrisse, Nr. 1]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1953. 79 pp.

Dal, Ingerid.—*Kurze Deutsche Syntax* [Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken german. Dialekte. B: Ergänz. Nr. 7]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1952. 232 pp.

Geiger, Karola.—*Deutsche Verse. Wege zum gesprochenen Deutsch.* Chicago: De Paul Univers. Bookstore, 1953. 179 pp. 2.75.

Grappin, Pierre.—*La Théorie du génie dans le préclassicisme allemand.* Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1952. 333 pp. Fr. 1200.

Hartmann von Aue.—*Der arme Heinrich.* Hrg. v. Hermann Paul, 10. Aufl. besorgt v. L. Wolff [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek Bd. 3]. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1953. xiv + 39 pp.

Hebbel, Friedrich.—*Poems. Select. & Edit.* by Edna Purdie [Blackwell's German Texts]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953. xxii + 182 pp. 10s. 6d.

Hohenstein, Lily.—*Adalbert Stifter.* Potsdam: Athenäum Verlag, 1952. 320 pp. DM 14.80.

Huebener, Theodore & Newmark, Maxim.—*A second Course in German.* New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1953. xix + 395 pp.

Jünger, Friedrich Georg.—*Rhythmus und Sprache im deutschen Gedicht.* Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1952. 158 pp. DM 9.50.

Kindermann, Heinz.—*Meister der Komödie.* Wien: Donau-Verlag, 1952. 240 pp. DM 18.65.

Kleist, Heinrich von.—*Three Stories.* Ed. by H. B. Garland [German Texts]. Manchester: University Press, 1953. 180 pp. 10s. 6d.

Kosch, Wilhelm (ed.).—*Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon*. [Doppel-Lieferung 18/19]. Bern: A. Francke, 1953. 1617-1808 pp. SFr. 16.80.

—Lindgren, Kaj B.—Die Apokope des mhd. -e in seinen verschiedenen Funktionen [Annales Acad. Scient. Fennicae, Ser. B. Vol. 78, 2]. Helsinki: Akademie Verlag, 1953. 225 pp.

Minerva. Jahrbuch d. gelehrten Welt. 34. Jahrgang. 1952. Abt. Universitäten u. Fachhochschulen. Vol. I: Europa. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952. xxi + 1123 pp. DM 124.-

Naumann, Hans.—*Deutsches Dichten und Denken v. d. german. z. staufischen Zeit*. 2. verb. Aufl. [Sammlung Götschen Vol. 1121]. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952. 166 pp. DM 2.40.

Olbrich, Wilhelm (ed.).—*Der Romanführer*. D. Inhalt d. dt. Romane u. Novellen vom Barock b. z. Naturalismus. 2 Vol. Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag, 1951-52. xvi + 763 pp. DM 36.-

Pascal, Roy.—*The German Sturm und Drang*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. xvi + 347 pp. \$4.75.

Puttkamer, Annemarie von.—*Franz Werfel*. Frankfurt: Werkbund, 1953. xii + 175 pp. DM 9.80.

Schmitt, Franz A.—*Beruf und Arbeit in dt. Erzählung*. E. literar. Lexikon. Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag, 1952. xvi + 667 pp. DM 28.-

Schneider, Hermann.—*Carl von Kraus zum Gedächtnis*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1953. 1 plate, 15 pp.

Schnitzler, Kafka, [Thomas] Mann.—Ed. by H. Hatfield & J. M. Stein. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953. viii + 188 pp.

Schönherr, Karl.—*Gesammelte Werke* hrg. v. V. Chiavacci. 2 Vol. Wien: Donau-Verlag, 1952. 30 + 1444 pp. DM 34.-

Timmermans, Lia.—*Mein Vater*. Wiesbaden: Insel Verlag, 1952. 16 pl., 208 pp. DM 12.-

Winkelman, John.—*Social Criticism in the Early Works of Erich Kästner*. [The University of Missouri Studies. Vol. xxv, No. 4]. Columbia: Curators of the Univ. of Missouri, 1953. 144 pp. \$2.50.

DUTCH

Kloeke, G. G.—*Verzamelde Opstellen, als Festgave aan de schrijver aangeboden bij zijn 65 ste verjaardag*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1952. xii + 227 pp.

FRENCH

Audisio, Gabriel.—*L'Algérie littéraire*. Paris: Encyclopédie coloniale, 1952. 16 pp.

Béalu, Marcel (ed.).—*Anthologie de la poésie française depuis le surréalisme*. Paris: Eds. de Beaune, 1952. 257 pp. Fr. 750.

Bédier, Joseph.—*The Romance of Tristan an Iseult*, tr. Hilaire Belloc and Paul Rosenfeld. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1953. 190 pp. \$.65.

Breitholtz, Lennart.—*Le Théâtre historique en France jusqu'à la Révolution*. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1952. 394 pp.

Brunot, Ferdinand.—*Histoire de la langue française*. T. XIII, L'époque réaliste. Première partie. Fin du Romantisme et Parnasse par Charles Bruneau. Paris: Colin 1953. xvi + 384 pp.

Bush, N. R.—*The Marquis d'Argens and his Philosophical Correspondence*. Columbia diss., 1953. iv + 248 pp.

Cramer, Lucien.—*Une famille genevoise: Les Cramer, leurs relations avec Voltaire, Rousseau et B. Franklin-Bache*. Geneva: Droz, 1952. 103 pp. SFr. 10.

Denkinger, Marc.—*Essentials of French Pronunciation*. Ann Arbor: Wahr, 1952. 169 pp. \$1.50.

Gauthier, Emmanuel.—*Le génie satirique de Louis Veuillot*. Lyons and Paris: E. Vitte, n. d. (1953). 478 pp.

Gide, André.—*Poésie, journal, souvenirs*. Ed. Dunoyer de Segonzac. 2 v. Paris: Gallimard, 1952. Fr. 10000.

Hall, Robert A., Jr. and Others.—*Haitian Creole. Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary*. Memoir 74 of the American Anthropological Ass., 1953. 309 pp.

Hugo, V.—*L'Œuvre*, éd. Maurice Levaillant. Paris: Delagrave, 1952. viii + 696 pp.

Josserand, Pierre.—*Table générale de la Revue d'hist. litt. de la France, 1909-1939*. Geneva: Droz, 1953. 182 pp. SFr. 28.

Lebesgue, Philéas.—*Œuvres poétiques*, éd. Matrat et Berrou. 3 v. Méru: Eds. du Thelle, 1950-52.

Lévy, Paul.—*La Langue allemande en France, pénétration et diffusion des origines à nos jours*. II. De 1830 à nos jours. Paris: IAC, 1952. 275 pp. (Bibl. de la Soc. des études germaniques, 8.)

Luppé, Robert de.—Albert Camus. *Paris*: Eds. universitaires, 1952. 126 pp. Fr. 210.

McLaren, James C.—The Theatre of André Gide. Evolution of a Moral Philosopher. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953. x + 117 pp. \$3.00. (J. H. Studies in Romance L. and L., extra vol. 28.)

Mansfield, Lester.—Le Comique de Marcel Proust. I. Proust et Baudelaire. *Paris*: Nizet, 1952. 222 pp. Fr. 500.

Mauriac, François.—Les Chemins de la mer, ed. L. C. Keating and J. O. Swain. *Boston*: Heath, 1953. xxviii + 188 pp. \$1.60.

Micks, W. and O. Longi.—The New Fundamental French. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1953. xxvi + 294 pp.

Moser, Ruth.—L'impressionnisme français. Peinture, littérature, musique. *Geneva*: Droz, 1952. 287 pp. SFr. 16.

Prévost.—Manon Lescaut, éd. Maurice Allen. *Paris*: Garnier, 1952. xvi + 293 pp. Fr. 380.

Proust.—Combray, ed. G. Brée and C. Lynes, Jr. *New York*: Appleton, 1952. ix + 235 pp. \$1.90.

Rutebeuf.—Poèmes concernant l'Université de Paris, éd. H. Lucas. *Paris*: Nizet, 1952. viii + 139 pp. Fr. 450.

Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de.—Paul et Virginie, éd. Maurice Souriau. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1952. xxvi + 243 pp. Fr. 500.

Sauerwein, H. A., Jr.—Agrippa d'Aubigné's *Les Tragiques*: A Study in Structure and Poetic Method. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953. xiv + 241 pp. \$3.50. (J. H. Studies in Romance L. and L., Extra Vol. 29.)

Saulnier, V.-L.—Les Élégies de Clément Marot. *Paris*: Soc. d'éd. d'enseignement supérieur, 1952. 160 pp. Fr. 475.

Voltaire.—Correspondence, ed. Theodore Besterman. Vol. I (1704-25), II (1726-32), III (1733-4). *Geneva*: Institut et Musée Voltaire, les Délices, 1953. xxii + 387 + xxi + 451 + xxii + 369 pp.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—Vita Nova, tr. Titta Del Valle. *Florence*: Le Monnier, 1952. 131 pp. L. 500.

Barbagallo, A.—Alessandro Manzoni. *Milan*: Gastaldi, 1952. 140 pp. L. 500.

Belli, G. G.—I Sonetti, ed. G. Vigolo. 3 v. *Milan*: Mondadori, 1952. 3400 pp. L. 18000.

Berselli, A.—La storia nei Promessi Sposi. *Rome*: Signorelli, 1952. 258 pp. L. 900.

Bigongiari, P.—Il senso della lirica italiana e altri studi. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. 292 pp. L. 1400.

Boccaccio.—I Decamerone, ed. M. Fubini, VII giornata. *Milan*: Universale economica, 1952. 95 pp. L. 150.

Cospito, A.—Dante giudice. Problemi di critica dantesca. *Padua*: C. E. D. A. M., 1952. 80 pp. L. 800.

Costanzo, M.—Giovanni Boine. *Rome*: Ateneo, 1952. 27 pp.

Dell'Arco, M. e P. P. Pasolini.—Poesia dialettale italiana. *Parma*: Guanda, 1952. 500 pp. L. 2000.

Fergusson, Francis.—Dante's Drama of the Mind. A Modern Reading of the *Purgatorio*. *Princeton*: U. Press, 1953. x + 232 pp. \$4.00.

Ferretti, G.—Pietro Giordani sino ai quarant'anni. *Rome*: Storia e Letteratura, 1952. 324 pp. L. 1600.

Fubini, M.—Il Canto XXVI dell' Inferno. *Rome*: Signorelli, 1952. 36 pp. L. 200.

Mazzitelli, M.—I Promessi Sposi visti da un medico. *Rome*: Signorelli, 1952. 280 pp. L. 900.

Nievo, I.—Opere ed. Sergio Romagnoli. *Naples*: Ricciardi, 1952. xxx + 1200 pp. L. 5000.

Oliveri, M. (ed.).—Antologia ariostea. *Turin*: Paravia, 1952. xvi + 392 pp. L. 700.

Parenti, M.—Bibliografia delle Opere di Silvio Pellico. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. 302 pp. L. 13300.

SPANISH

Astrana Marín, Luis.—Vida . . . de Cervantes. V. III. *Madrid*: Ed. Reus, 1951. 599 pp.

Batchelor, C. M. (ed.).—Cuentos de acá y de allá. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1953. xx + 192 pp. \$2.50.

Berkowitz, H. C.—La biblioteca de Benito Pérez Galdós. *Las Palmas*: Eds. El Museo Canario, 1951. 227 pp.

Clarke, D. C.—Chronological Sketch of Castilian Versification, list of its metric terms. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal., 1952. 103 pp. \$1.00.

Correa Calderón, E. (ed.).—Costumbristas españoles. T. II. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1951. 1381 pp.

García-Luengo, Eusebio. — Revisión del teatro de F. García Lorca. *Madrid*: Cuadernos de política y lit., 1951. 34 pp.

Gullón, R.—Cisne sin lago. Vida y obra de Enrique Gil y Carrasco. *Madrid*: Insula, 1951. 266 pp.

Hesse, E. W. (ed.).—Spanish verse of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. *Madison, Wis.*: College Typing, 1951. 261 pp.

Horrent, Jules. — "Roncesvalles." Etude sur le fragment de "cantar de gesta" conservé à l'Archivo de Navarra. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1951. 262 pp.

Jiménez de Encisco, D.—El encubierto y Juan Latino, ed. Juliá Martínez. *Madrid*: Real Academia, 1951. lxxi + 357 pp.

Lainez, Pedro. — Poesías, ed. A. Marin Ocete. *Granada*: Universidad, 1950. xviii + 385 pp.

Maluenda, J. A. — Obras, ed. Juliá Martínez. 2 v. *Madrid*: C. S. I. C., 1951. xvi + 179 + 313 pp.

Maret, F. — Exégèse de Don Quichotte. *Brussels*: Armes de Minerve, 1950. 111 pp.

Martínez Amador, E. M.—Amador Shorter Spanish Dictionary. *Boston*: Heath, 1953. xi + 555 pp.

Menéndez Pidal, R. — Reliquias de la poesía épica española. *Madrid*: Eds. Cultura Hispánica, 1951. lxxxix + 292 pp.

Montesinos, J. F. — Estudios sobre Lope. *Mexico*: El Colegio de México, 1951. 332 pp.

Procter, E. S. — Alfonso X of Castile. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1951. vi + 149 pp.

Rosenblat, Angel.—Vacilaciones de género en los monosílabos. *Caracas*: 1951. 24 pp.

Salvador, Carles. — Lliçons de gramàtica valenciana. *Valencia*: Ortega, 1951. 208 pp.

Shoemaker, W. H. — Spanish Minimum. *Boston*: Heath, 1953. xii + 160 pp.

Simón Díaz, J. — Bibliografía de la lit. hispánica. V. II. *Madrid*: C. S. I. C., 1951. xxi + 387 pp.

Torres Quintero, R.—Bibliografía de R. J. Cuervo. *Bogotá*: Caro y Cuervo, 1951. 104 pp.

Torres-Rioseco, A. — La gran lit. ibero-americana. *Buenos Aires*: Emecé, 1951. 352 pp.

Ucelay Dacal, Margarita. — Los españoles pintados por sí mismos (1843-4). *Mexico*: El Colegio de México, 1951. 266 pp.

Valle Inclán.—Publicaciones periodísticas anteriores a 1895, ed. W. L. Fichter y Al-

fonso Reyes. *Mexico*: El Colegio de México, 1952. 222 pp.

Varela Jácome, Benito.—Historia de la lit. gallega. *Santiago de Compostela*: Porto, 1951. 462 pp.

Vargas Ugarte, R. (ed.).—Nuestro romancero. *Lima*: Clásicos peruanos, 1951. 234 pp.

PORTUGUESE

Camiliana & Vária. Revista-Boletim do Círculo camiliano, nos. 1-4. *Lisbon*: Jan.-Dec., 1951, Jan.-Mar., 1952. 192 pp.

Castilho, Guilherme de. — António Nobre. *Lisbon*: Bertrand, 1950. 325 pp.

Cidade, Hernani.—Luís de Camões. O Épico. 2 ed. revista e ampliada. *Lisbon*: Bertrand, 1953. viii + 235 pp.

Renato de Mendonça (ed. y tr.).—Antología de la Poesía Brasileña. *Madrid*: Eds. Cultura Hispánica, 1952. 305 pp.

SLAVIC

Harkins, W. E.—Bibliography of Slavic Folk Literature. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1953. vi + 28 pp. \$.90.

Senn, A. and A. A. Rozhdestvensky. — Russian in 20 Lessons. *New York*: Cortina, 1952. 444 pp. \$2.95.

GENERAL

Aston, S. C. (ed.).—The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies. Vol. XII, 1950. *Cambridge [and N. Y.]*: Cambridge U. Press, 1951 [for Feb., 1952]. viii + 363 pp. \$8.00.

Flew, A. G. N. (ed.).—Logic and Language (Second Series). *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1953. viii + 242 pp. \$4.75.

Hatzfeld, Helmut A.—A Critical Bibliography of the New Stylistics Applied to the Romance Literatures, 1900-52. *Chapel Hill*: Box 537, 1953. xxii + 302 pp. (U. of N. C. Studies in Comp. Lit., 5.)

Horn, Francis (ed.).—Literary Masterpieces of the Western World. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953. xx + 255 pp. \$3.50.

Jones, Helen F.—Foreign Langs. in the Secondary School Curriculum. *Eugene, Ore.*: U. of Ore., 1953. 17 pp. \$.30. (Curriculum Bulletin, no. 123.)

Reiss, Samuel.—The Universe of Meaning. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1953. xii + 227 pp. \$6.00.

co,

lit.

to,

an-

34

do

n.-

re.

O

n:

to-

is.

vic

wn

na,

in

50.

U.

pp.

an-

lo-

pp.

io-

he

H:

C.

er-

re:

pp.

he

e.e.:

cu-

ng.

53.

3

o,

ft.

o,

n-

34

lo

l-

e.

0

u:

o-

s.

ic

rn

—

a,

in

40.

U.

p.

n-

o-

p.

so-

he

1:

C.

er-

e:

pp.

he

z.:

eu-

ng.

53.

Spring Publications

in Belles-Lettres

and Literary Criticism

JAMES C. McLAREN
THE THEATRE OF ANDRÉ GIDE \$3.00

H. A. SAUERWEIN
AGRIPPA D'AUBIGNÉ'S LES TRAGIQUES \$3.50

PANOS PAUL MORPHOS
THE DIALOGUES OF GUY DE BRUÉS \$4.50

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER
FRENCH TRAGEDY IN THE REIGN OF LOUIS XVI AND
THE EARLY YEARS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION \$5.00

LESTER G. CROCKER
TWO DIDEROT STUDIES: Ethics and Esthetics \$2.50

EARL WASSERMAN
THE FINER TONE—Keats' Major Poems \$4.00

FRANCIS HORN (ed.)
LITERARY MASTERPIECES OF THE WESTERN WORLD \$3.50



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

Modern presentation of Portuguese grammar

SÁ PEREIRA

Brazilian Portuguese Grammar

A beginning course for students particularly interested in Brazil. Each of thirty-five lessons supplies mastery drills, idiom study, oral practice, and reading selections.

HILLS, FORD, AND COUTINHO

A Portuguese Grammar

HILLS, FORD, COUTINHO, AND MOFFATT

Portuguese Grammar, Revised

RENO, CIOFFARI, AND HALL

Spoken Portuguese, Basic Course



D. C. Heath and Company

SALES OFFICES: NEW YORK 14 CHICAGO 16 SAN FRANCISCO 5 ATLANTA 3 DALLAS 1
HOME OFFICE: BOSTON 16

TWO DIDEROT STUDIES:

Ethics and Esthetics

By **LESTER G. CROCKER**

The theoretical questions which most preoccupied Diderot and his age were concerned with the great problems of ethics and esthetics. Diderot's thinking on these subjects, however, has proven baffling to his interpreters, and has led to a bewildering variety of interpretations.

From the viewpoint of philosophy and the history of ideas, Dr. Crocker has approached the tangle of Diderot's ethical and esthetic theories and has retraced, with remarkable clarity, their evolution, development and final synthesis. The result is a highly original contribution to our knowledge of this important, but difficult, eighteenth century figure.

1953

156 pages

\$2.50



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND